REYN[illegible] TORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

GEN

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1864

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/methodistquarter4641meth

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1864.

VOLUME XLVI.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XVI.

D. D. WHEDON, D.D., EDITOR.

New York:
PUBLISHED BY CARLTON & PORTER,
200 MULBERRY-STREET.
1864.

X 706195

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLVI.—1864.

JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF "THE INSTITUTES OF THEOLOGY," BY REV. RICHARD WATSON..... 5
Rev. B. F. Cocker, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

THE SAINTS OF THE DESERT: ST. ANTHONY OF EGYPT, AND SYMEON THE STYLITE..... 29
Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., Mercersburg, Pa.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN..... 41
Prof. S. D. Hillman, Carlisle, Pa.

THE EMOTIONAL ELEMENT IN HEBREW TRANSLATION. [Fourth Article]..... 57
Prof. Tayler Lewis, Union College, Schenectady.

CONDITION AND CHARACTER OF NEGROES IN AFRICA..... 77
Theodore Dwight, Esq., Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE PRISON ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK..... 90
Rev. E. C. Wines, D.D., LL.D., New York.

JAMES FLOY, D.D..... 111
Rev. Daniel Curry, D.D., New York.

Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 136
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 141
Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 144
Quarterly Book-Table..... 155

APRIL NUMBER.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF WATSON'S INSTITUTES. [Second Article.] 181
Rev. B. F. Cocker, Ann Arbor, Mich.

HAGENBACH ON THE LATER HISTORY OF THE CHURCH..... 195
Rev. J. F. Hurst, A. M., Elizabeth, New Jersey.

OUR LORD'S PRAYER IN THE GARDEN..... 216
Rev. N. Vansant, Tottenville, Staten Island, N. Y.

ARITHMETIC..... 233
Rev. John Wheeler, President of Baldwin University, Berea, O.

SCHILLER..... 242
Translated from the "Revue Chretienne."

EARLY METHODISM AND EARLY AMERICA: JAMES WATT AND JOHN WESLEY..... 256
Rev. Abel Stevens, LL.D., Mamaroneck, N. Y.

THE PARSEES..... 278
Alexander J. Schem, Esq., New York.

SIR THOMAS BROWNE..... 294
Rev. Luther W. Peck, A.M., Kingston, N. Y.

THE WAR FOR THE UNION..... 307
Capt. James F. Rusling, Nashville, Tenn.

Foreign Religious Intelligence..... 316
Foreign Literary Intelligence..... 322
Synopsis of the Quarterlies..... 326
Quarterly Book-Table..... 337

JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

JOHN DEMPSTER, D.D. 357
Rev. HENRY BANNISTER, D.D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

THE UNAUTHORIZED CALVINISM OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE 380
Rev. J. J. TUETON, East Genesee Conference.

EDWARD LIVINGSTON 396
Mrs. JULIA M. OLIN, New York.

THE BATTLE OF BLENHEIM 419
Rev. HENRY W. WARREN, A.B., Westfield, Mass.

THE NICODEMITES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY 436
Rev. HENRY M. BAIRD, Professor in the University of the City of New York.

OUR ANTIPODES 454
Rev. GEORGE M. STEELE, Fitchburgh, Mass.

CHRISTOLOGY 478
Rev. JAMES F. CHAFFEE, Minneapolis, Minn.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE 490

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE 497

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES 500

QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE 508

OCTOBER NUMBER.

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION 533
Prof. FALES H. NEWHALL, Middletown, Conn.

THE MORAL CONDITION OF INFANTS 552
Rev. CYRUS BROOKS, D.D., St. Paul, Minn.

LEO THE GREAT AND THE PAPACY IN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES 574
Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., New York.

WHEDON ON THE WILL 595
Rev. B. F. COCKER, A.M., Ann Arbor, Mich.

THE NIBELUNGEN LIED 619
Prof. ANDREW TEN BROOK, Ann Arbor, Mich.

A TREATISE ON HOMILETICS 641
F. G. HIBBARD, D.D., Clifton Springs, N. Y.

FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE 658

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE 662

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES 664

QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE 676

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1864.

ART. I.—THE MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF "THE INSTITUTES OF THEOLOGY," BY REV. RICHARD WATSON.

STANDING on some lofty peak of the Andes, the traveler may see the head-waters of the great South American rivers mingling in one. But soon they separate, and, becoming more and more divergent in their course as they rush onward toward the sea, their mouths are at last separated by the length of a whole continent. So the student in philosophy, standing on the elevated plain of analytic thought, discovers that the two great philosophic systems which have divided the suffrages of learned men, and placed them on totally opposite poles of thought, have their common starting-point in the one question, "Are there any ideas in the human mind which have not come in through the senses from the external world?" Here are the head-waters of the sensational and transcendental schools of philosophy mingling in one, and just as the Amazon and La Plata flow on in opposite directions until they have reached the extremities of the continent, so from the *yea* or *nay* of this great question, the rivers of philosophic thought flow on in diverse courses until they have reached the antipodes.

If you take the negative side of the question you are a sensationalist, and belong to the school of Locke. Hence *sense* is, for you, the only avenue of knowledge. All the simple ideas existing in the mind are the result of material impressions made upon the sensorium. They are photographs of the external world, the copies that remain after the sensations

themselves have ceased.* Then the mind is a mere *passivity*. It has receptivity, but not spontaneity. It has appetency, but not self-determining power. Now you logically tend toward materialism.† If all mental phenomena are resolvable into sensation and association, why may not the mind itself be material? If our ideas are only the traces of material impressions, it is most natural to suppose that the substance upon which these copies are preserved is also material, and all mental operations may now be resolved into mere vibratiuncles of the brain. A material nature can have no *à priori* intuitions; it cannot apprehend fundamental and necessary truth. Its highest conception of moral law is but a calculation of pleasure and pain, a balance of profit and loss. On this theory you can form no rational conception of causation. Creation is inconceivable. Spiritual existences are impossible. God is a nullity.

These consequences are, of course, escaped by taking refuge in *faith*, and planting your feet on the authority of a supernatural revelation attested by supernatural evidences. The truth of Christianity becomes now a simple question of historic fact, to be decided by the same rules of evidence which are applied to all history, with this essential difference however, that your facts are "*sui generis*." They are not facts within the field of nature and experience, and they are consequently burdened by an *à priori* improbability. The fundamental ideas of God, duty, and accountability rest solely upon miracles. You have no substratum of necessary intuitions or primitive beliefs lying at the basis of revelation. Your only idea of virtue is the doing good to mankind in obedience to the revealed will of God for the sake of eternal happiness.‡ There can be no unselfish, disinterested love of God or man.

If you take your stand on the affirmative side of the ques-

* James Mill: "Analysis of the Phenomena of Mind."

† How closely Locke verges toward materialism is indicated in the earnestness with which he contends that God might endow matter with a faculty of *thinking* and with it of *self-consciousness*, (see book iv, chapter 3, section 6, and notes.) If thought and self-consciousness *may* be properties of matter under any form, then they are not the *essential characteristic* properties of mind or spirit, and we cannot discriminate between the two. We regret that Watson should have given any countenance to this doctrine. At page 83, vol. ii, he says, "*that self-consciousness is an essential attribute of spirit cannot be proved.*"

‡ Paley: "Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy."

tion, you are so far a *transcendentalist.* For you there are sources of knowledge which transcend experience. The mind itself is the native source of *à priori* cognitions, beliefs, and judgments. These well up from the depths of the soul. "They leap ready-armed from the womb of reason, like Pallas from the head of Jupiter." True, these primary truths of reason are revealed in consciousness under experienced conditions. They appear in the concrete, and not in the abstract form; but we can separate them from what is contingent and empirical, and clearly discriminate them as necessary and universal. Now mind is *spiritual*, not material. It is essentially active, not inertly passive. It has an original spontaneity. It is invested with power and dignity. It is not determined by mere aversion or desire. It can obey the voice of conscience, or it can surrender itself to passion. It can choose between right and wrong, regardless of painful or pleasurable consequences. It is essentially self-moved and self-determined. It is no longer in bondage to nature; it is a living energy controlling nature. Now *causation* becomes to us a reality. Mind is the proper analagon of power, and supplies a type of real efficiency. Now creation is possible. Immortality is credible. The existence of God is an unquestionable truth. Philosophy and Faith may now go hand in hand; and on the platform of necessary and universal truth, which philosophic analysis has cleared, you may plant the Christian system of redeeming and remedial measures, even though they may be *supernatural* interpretations, and feel that all *à priori* improbabilities are counterbalances, and canceled by the analogies which are presented in the operations of the human mind on the material universe. When mind has become to you a real power, and, within its sphere, a real *cause*, governing, controlling, and modifying nature, effecting new collocations and arrangements of material forces, and securing new results, then we have little difficulty in conceiving, and less in believing, that the Infinite Mind interposes continually, controlling and modifying nature to secure moral and spiritual ends, or, in other words, performs a *miracle.*

Thus the intimate relation between philosophy and religion becomes at once apparent, and the influence which a man's philosophic opinions must necessarily exert upon his theological

system must be obvious to every reflecting mind, so that "as is a man's philosophy, so is his theology."

In a previous article (April, 1862) we endeavored to appreciate the amount of influence which the sensational philosophy of Locke has exerted upon the theology of Watson as developed in his management of the theistic argument. We now propose to estimate the influence which the *ethical* phase of that philosophy has exerted upon his views of the *nature of man in its relations to the moral law*, or, in other words, to discuss the MORAL *Philosophy* of the Institutes of Theology.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY *is the science of the Moral Law, and of the nature of man as the subject of Moral Law.* As such it presents several fundamental questions for our consideration. 1. Is there that which is *immutably right;* the same to all created minds, and to the *Uncreated?* 2. Whence do we derive the *idea of the right* in human conduct? 3. What are the *essential conditions* of human accountability? and, 4. What is the *ground of obligation* to do right? A sharper analysis may perhaps resolve all these questions into one, *Whence do we derive our ideas of right, duty, and accountability?*

Every man's answer to these questions will be largely determined by his philosophic opinions. He may profess to answer them simply as a theologian, but he will necessarily, though unconsciously, be influenced by his philosophy. He can never relegate himself from the laws of thought which are imposed upon his intelligence; nor can he totally divest himself of the principles and ideas which, as the outbirth of philosophic thought, have become inextricably interwoven with all systems of knowledge, and all theological opinions.

If we are *sensationalists* with Locke, then we must be *utilitarians* with Paley. His moral philosophy is unquestionably the ethical phase of the empirical philosophy. Then there is for us no immutable morality. There are no original native practical principles imposed upon the mind as laws of conduct. Our idea of the right is contingent, and not *necessary; relative*, and not *absolute*. It is grounded on interest, or utility, or expediency. The distinction in the moral quality of actions is derived from *experience* of their good or evil influence upon society. And the pleasurable or painful consequences which

may result to ourselves and to society are the strongest *motives* which govern human conduct.*

This ethical phase of the sensational philosophy receives some modifications when taken up into a theological system. Then our ideas of right and wrong are derived *solely from revelation.* Then "the rule which determines the quality of moral actions must be presumed to be matter of [ORAL] revelation from God.† Morality is right because God commands it. And "the only satisfactory answer which the question as to the source of moral obligation can receive is, *it is based upon the will of God.*" ‡ This is usually designated "the theological system of morals."

In justice to Watson, we are constrained to distinctly note that, in the Institutes, he nowhere formally adopts the definition of virtue proposed by Paley—"the doing good to mankind in obedience to the revealed will of God *for the sake of eternal happiness.*" He also very casually and incidentally remarks, that the ideas of right and wrong "must have their foundation in the *reality of things.*" It would be exceedingly interesting to be able to determine what Mr. Watson means by the "reality of things," or upon what authority his "*must be*" is based. Because he is careful to assert with marked emphasis that "morals can have *no* authority disjoined from Christianity," and that our ideas of *fitness*, beauty, general interest, or the *natural authority of truth are all mere matters of opinion.*"§ The obligation to perform any duty does not therefore rest upon our perception of its reasonableness, its fitness, its inherent rightness, or its harmony with immutable and eternal justice, but solely on the will of God. "That which in truth binds the creature is not the *nature* of the command issued by

* "The distinction in the moral quality of actions . . . may in part be traced to its having been observed that certain actions are *injurious to society*, and that to abstain from them is essential to the wellbeing of society. Anger, revenge, cupidity have been deemed evils as the source of injuries of various kinds, and humanity, self-government, and integrity have been ranked as virtues; and thus both certain actions, and the principles from whence they spring, have *from their effects on society been determined to be good or evil.*"

"It has likewise been observed by every man that individual happiness, as truly as social order and interests are materially affected by particular acts, and by those feelings of the heart which give rise to them . . . and that whatever civilized men have *agreed to call vice* is inimical to health of body, or peace of mind, or both."—INSTITUTES, vol. i, page 6.

† Theological Institutes, vol. i, p. 8. ‡ Ibid., vol. ii, p. 477. § Ibid., vol. ii, p. 473.

God, [not its rightness or justice,] but the relation in which the creature stands to God." *

That man has no original ideas of right and wrong—no intuitive cognitions of what is just and unjust—that the mind has within itself no standards of right, is a fundamental principle of Watson's philosophy, or, if you please, of his theology. The knowledge of right and wrong is derived solely from without. It *may* have been dimly and imperfectly suggested by *experience* and *observation* of the tendency of actions to promote or obstruct human happiness. But "the evidence of both history and tradition shows that so far from these rules, by which the moral quality of actions is determined, having *originated* from observation of what was injurious, and what beneficial to mankind, there has been among all nations a constant reference to a *declared* will of the supreme God." †

"A direct communication of the Divine Will as made to the primogenitors of our race," and to that source *alone* all the ideas of right and wrong which have existed in any age, or among any people, are to be traced. "Whatever is found pure in morals in ancient or modern writers, may be traced to *indirect* revelation." ‡ *Verbal instruction*—tradition or Scripture—thus becomes the source of all our ideas of right and wrong, of duty, and of obligation.

These fundamental principles of Mr. Watson's philosophy very naturally determine all his other views of *the moral nature of man.*

Man is a moral agent because he is *able* to understand a command when given, and to obey or disobey that command. The only *subjective* ground, or condition of human responsibility, is the power of voluntary choice. The law which determines the quality of action is purely *objective.* Man is in no sense "a law unto himself." And if he have no knowledge of the verbal, extrinsic law he is irresponsible.

Mr. Watson's definition of a moral agent may perhaps imply, but it does not affirm, that the law must be intelligently apprehended by the agent. "An action is rendered moral by two circumstances: that it is *voluntary*, and that it has respect to *some rule* which determines it to be good or evil." § Here

* Theological Institutes, vol. ii, page 477.
† Ibid., vol. i, page 7.
‡ Theological Institutes, vol. ii, page 470.
§ Ibid., vol. i, page 5.

there is no recognition of conscience—of reason sitting in judgment upon conduct, or affirming any obligation. The definition of moral good and evil given by Locke and adopted by Watson is the only one possible on this theory. "It is the conformity or disagreement of our voluntary actions to *some law whereby good or evil is drawn upon us by the will, or power of the law-maker.*"*

An attempt to construct a science of moral law upon *à priori* principles is therefore in Mr. Watson's opinion not only "futile," but also "mischievous" in its tendency. It is "futile" because the materials are, in reality, drawn from revelation, and "dishonestly placed to the account of human reason." It is of "mischievous tendency," because it "disjoins moral rules from Divine authority, and puts Christianity wholly out of sight."[!]† And finally, moral philosophy has been clearly proved to be an utter impossibility. "As far as man's reason has applied itself to the discovery of truth, or *duty*, it has generally gone astray."‡ "There was little agreement among the sages of antiquity even upon the first principles of morals."§ "Questions in morals do not, for the most part, lie level to the minds of the populace. The greater part of mankind want leisure and capacity for demonstration, nor can carry on a train of proofs which in that way they must always depend upon for conviction."‖ "Their conclusions would have no *authority*, and place them under no *obligation*."¶ And, indeed, man without a revelation "is without *moral control*, without *principles of justice*, except such as may be slowly elaborated from those relations which concern the grosser interest of life; without CONSCIENCE; without *hope* or *fear* in another life."**

The doctrine of Watson may now be summed up in the following propositions:

1. *The human mind has no original, native ideas of the right, the just, the good. Whatever ideas it may possess are derived, primarily, from direct revelation; secondarily, from tradition and instruction.*

2. *The obligation to choose the right does not rest on the*

* Theological Institutes, vol. i, page 5.
† Ibid., vol. ii, pp. 472–473.
‡ Theological Institutes, vol. ii, page 470.
§ Ibid., vol. i, page 17.
‖ Theological Institutes, vol. i, pp. 15–17.
¶ Ibid., vol. i, page 228.
** Theological Institutes, vol. ii, page 271.

authority of conscience as itself a revelation of the Divine righteousness, but solely on the command of God, as contained in his written word.

We venture to dissent from his teaching on the following grounds:

1. *The affirmation that the human mind has no native, original ideas of right, but that they are all derived from revelation, is in conflict with revelation itself.*

It is setting up for Scripture a claim which it does not assert for itself. The Bible does not claim to be the original source of all our ideas of right and wrong. On the contrary, it proceeds continually on the assumption that there is an inherent, independent rightness in virtue anterior to all legislation, and which rightness is intuitively perceived by the human mind. "The statutes of the Lord are RIGHT, rejoicing the heart." "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for that is RIGHT." "Even of your own selves judge ye not what is RIGHT?" "Whatsoever things are *true* . . . are *honest* . . . are *just* . . . are *pure* . . . are *lovely* . . . are of *good report*—if there be any *virtue*, and if there be any *praise*—be such the objects of your esteem." The rightness here is not one which is ordained, it is inherent. Children are commanded to obey their parents *because* it is in itself right. The command does not constitute the rightness. Here there is also supposed a natural capacity in man to perceive what is right and just and honest and true. It is taken for granted that these are the things which are of "good report" in every period and country, and that in all ages the "virtue" and the "praise" go together. Here is thus an obvious recognition of the voice of conscience in the individual, and of the voice of universal consciousness as revealed in the moral history of our race. Not only do the Scriptures accord to man the capacity of judging what is right in human conduct, but even in the Divine procedure. When Abraham ventures the solemn expostulation, "Wilt thou destroy the righteous with the wicked? That be far from thee to do after this manner. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do *right?*" there is no disapprobation expressed as to the judgment which a creature dares to pass on what is *right* for the Divine administration. Nay, God appeals to the reason of his creatures as to

the rectitude of his government, and permits the fundamental principles of his administration to be arraigned at the bar of the human conscience. "Are not my ways *equal?*" "*Judge*, I pray you, betwixt me and my vineyard!" But how can a mortal pronounce upon the Divine procedure, that it is "righteous altogether," if there are no native standards of right erected in his own soul?

That moral law does exist subjectively in all human minds is distinctly affirmed by Paul in a passage which well deserves to be regarded as the chief corner-stone of moral science. "The Gentiles (ἔθνη, heathen) which have not the written law, do, by the guidance of nature, (reason or conscience,) the works enjoined by the revealed law; these, having no written law, are *a law unto themselves*, who show plainly the works of the law written on their hearts, their *conscience* bearing witness, and also their *reasonings* one with another when they accuse, or else excuse, each other."* To deny this is to relegate the heathen from all responsibility. "For the will of a superior is not in justice binding until it is in some mode *sufficiently* declared."† Now, in the righteous adjudgments of revelation the heathen are "without excuse." The will of God must therefore be "sufficiently declared" to constitute them accountable. Who will presume to affirm that the shadowy, uncertain, variable, easily and unavoidably corrupted medium of tradition, running through forty muddy centuries, is a "sufficient declaration of the will of God?" The law is "written on the heart" of every man, or all men are not accountable.

2. *The affirmation that the human mind has no original native ideas of the just, the right, and the good, renders invalid the internal evidences of the divinity of the Scriptures.*

"The internal evidence" is defined by Mr. Watson to be "that which arises from the consideration of the doctrines taught as *being consistent with the character of God*, and their tendency to promote the *virtue* and happiness of man."—Vol. i, p. 88.

But is it not at once apparent, that if we know nothing of the "character of God" save what is taught us in revelation, then the "internal evidence" is simply the agreement of the "doctrines taught" with the "doctrines taught," which is no evidence at all. It is simply the agreement of Scripture with

* Romans xi, 14, 16. "Macknight's Trans." † Watson, vol. i, page 9.

Scripture. To say of the will of God that it is "just" and "good," if all "rightness" and "goodness" consist in conformity to the Divine will, is, in fact, no more than saying that the will of God is the will of God. And "to praise the pure morality of the Gospel, if the Gospel itself be the only source from whence we derive our ideas of morality, is merely attributing to the Gospel the praise of being conformable to rules derived from itself."* This kind of argument does not carry us one step toward a satisfying conviction that the Bible is a revelation from God. If the human mind has no intuitive perception of what is right—if the mind has within itself no original standard of right, the "internal evidences" have no argumentative value. They are an exhibition of weakness rather than of strength.

Indeed, it is evident that Mr. Watson himself places little reliance upon this form of proof. His reasoning is burdened with the consciousness that, under the qualifications and conditions with which he has environed it, it is valueless. Accordingly he tells us that "*the* evidence of the authority of revelation is afforded by miracles ALONE." "They are the *decisive* and *absolute* evidences of a revelation from God."† "The sacred writers urge the miracles as the decisive proof, without *ever taking into consideration the nature of the doctrine.*"‡ And for us to attempt "to try a professed revelation by our own notions of what is *worthy of God* ('consistent with the character of God,' page 88) and beneficial to mankind, is to assume that independent of revelation we know what God is, or can say what is worthy or unworthy of him."§ Thus to the sagacious mind of Watson it was apparent that, to a philosophy which denies the human mind any primary intuitions in regard to God, right, duty, or immortality, the "internal evidence" is of no value.

Is there then no internal evidence in the Bible of its being the word of God? Surely there is. And it is most convincing. It is the *self-recommending* evidence which the word of God carries along with it to the conscience of every man. The Gospel is "a manifestation of truth and duty which commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God."‖ It is

* Archbishop Whately. † "Theological Institutes," vol. i, page 91.
‡ "Theological Institutes," vol. i, page 91. § Ibid., vol. i, page 90.
‖ 2 Cor. iv, 2.

found in the verisimilitude—the truth-likeness of its utterances—the tone of downright earnestness and sincerity and honesty which pervades it. It is in its "meeting, waking up, answering to the deep longings, wants, sins, fears, and hopes of man."* And, above all, it draws out those intimations of the being and character of God which are written in dim outline on the human soul, and answers to all the ideas of right and justice and equity and goodness which are imbedded in the conscience of man. This is the power and grandeur of *self-attestation. This* is the evidence whose force is felt alike by the educated and the uneducated—the evidence on which the masses of Christian men rest with an unfaltering faith. They know little or nothing of the arguments of Leland, or Leslie, or Paley; but they feel and appreciate the internal, self-announcing, self-recommending evidence of God's word, because it has spoken to their inmost soul, and they know that God is there!

The validity of this argument for the divinity of the Scriptures is grounded upon the principle that there is a perfect accordance between the fundamental truths and principles of inspiration and the ideas of fundamental truth and morality existing in the human soul. The moral law written on the heart is identical with the moral law written on the tables of stone. The revealed code answers to the "λοινὴ ἔννοια"†—the common sentiments of mankind.

3. *That the human mind is so constituted as* INTUITIVELY *to apprehend moral distinctions and laws we argue from the character of its Divine Author.*

Creation must necessarily be a manifestation of God. If he put forth his energy in creative acts, that creation must necessarily bear the impress, and be a reflection of his own mind. It must express his own *thoughts;* it must embody and realize his own *ideas*, so far as the materials will permit. Just as we see the mind of man exhibited in his works—his skill, his taste, his ideal expressed in his literary or artistic creations, so we expect to see the mind of God displayed in his works. The pure, the intense, the visionary impersonation which the artist had impressed upon his own mind was wrought out in Psyche. The colossal grandeur of Michael Angelo's *ideals*, the etherial mildness and saintly elegance of Raphael's were *realized* upon

* Young: "Province of Reason," page 194. † Plutarch.

their canvas. So that he who is familiar with the ideal of the sculptor or the painter, can identify his creations even when the author's name is not affixed. And so the *thoughts* of the Eternal are expressed in the material forms around us, his *ideas* are symbolized in the visible universe, and his *plans* are revealed in history. If, then, we can learn the nature of a cause by studying its effects—if we can discover the final cause of an organ by observing its functional powers—if we can discover the ideal of an artist by studying his creations—so may we read the character of God in his works around us and within us.

In the human soul, as a spiritual essence, we may not only expect to catch some lines and lineaments of the spiritual nature of God, but also some *reflection of his moral character.* If we see *omnipotence* in the mighty masses and forces of the material universe; if we see *intelligence* in the arrangements and special adaptations of man's physical nature; if we see *goodness* in the direct subserviency of the material world to the convenience and happiness of man, we can also see the moral qualities of the Creator—his *justice* and *righteousness* and *truth* in the constitution and laws of man's spiritual nature.

The mind of man is the *chef-d'œuvre* of divine art. It is figured after the model which the Divine nature supplies. "Let us make man in our *image* after our *likeness.*" That image consists in ἐπίγνωσις, knowledge; δικαιοσύνη, justice; and ὁσιότης,* beneficence. It is not merely the *capacity* to know, to be just, and to be beneficent; it is *actual* knowledge, justice, and beneficence. It supposes, 1, that the fundamental ideas of truth, justice, and goodness are native to the mind; and 2, that the full choice and determination of the *will* is toward the realization of these ideas in every mental state, and every form of human activity. And though he be now fallen, there is in him still "the law of the mind"—the reason, the conscience, though in conflict with depraved passions and appetites—"the law in the members." There is yet a natural, constitutional sympathy of reason with the revealed law of God; "it delights in that law;" "it consents that it is good;" but it is overborne and obstructed by passion.†

Whatever the depravity of man, his declared war is not with

* ὅσιος from the חָסִיד —kind, merciful, benevolent.

† Squier: "Reason and the Bible."

virtue as such. He does not hate justice as justice, truth as truth, benevolence as benevolence. He recognizes their inherent rightness, he asserts their importance, he admires their excellency, he is pleased with their exhibition in other men, even though he violate them all. The fall did not take away one essential element of man's rational, spiritual being, though it perverted, and gave a wrong direction to them all. Man is still "the image and glory of God"* in his reason, his intelligence, his dominion, though not in his disordered passions and his *will.* He must still have the same ideas of right as dwell in the Infinite mind. He must affirm the same moral judgments. He must feel the same satisfaction and joy in beholding and choosing the right as is felt by God.

4. *The universal consciousness of our race, as revealed in human history, languages, legislation and sentiments, bear testimony to the fact that the ideas of right, duty, and moral desert are native to the human mind.*

That there is a native *tendency* in the human mind to discriminate the quality of actions, and to affirm moral distinctions, will not be denied. It is unquestionable that, in presence of voluntary actions, we at once recognize them as having a *moral* quality. We characterize some as good, others as bad; some as right, others as wrong. We know that one class *ought* to be performed, the other *ought not.* We feel that when we have performed the wrong act we deserve blame and punishment, and when we have performed the right act we deserve approval and reward.

That such moral distinctions have been made, and such moral judgments have been passed in *all* ages, and by *all* men —the old and the young, the learned and the ignorant, the savage and the civilized—is attested by the history, languages, laws, philosophies, traditions, religions, common sentiments, and usages of universal humanity.

The question to be decided, then, is simply this, "Are these moral judgments *intuitive?*" and if so, "are they based upon fundamental ideas of right, duty, and demerit, *native to the human mind?*"

The marks and criteria by which INTUITIONS are to be recognized are, 1, they are *self-evident*, and need no proof; 2, they

* 1 Cor. xi, 7.

are *necessary*, and must be believed; 3, they are *universal*. When apprehended they are believed by *all*.

Moral distinctions have all these marks and peculiarities of intuitive truths, therefore they are native intuitions of the mind. *Moral distinctions are self-evident.* They are seen in their own light, and rest upon their own evidence. The distinctions between justice and injustice, right and wrong, truth and falsehood, are at once perceived on the bare contemplation of them. They are not deduced from any previous propositions or premises, they are not established by any reasoning, and they are incapable of demonstration. No explanations can make them clearer, no arguments can make them stronger than when first apprehended. No man ever attempts to *prove* first it is wrong for any one to take away his property without his consent, and without furnishing him a just equivalent. He simply affirmed *that it is wrong*, and that is a sufficient reason for all intelligent beings. It finds a response in the universal conscience of the race.

Moral distinctions are necessary. The laws of our intelligence compel us to affirm them as real and immutable. The contrary cannot be conceived, or if conceived, it is absurd. It is as impossible to believe that there are intelligences to whom injustice can appear right, or falsehood appear a virtue, as to conceive that there are beings to whom two and two equals five, or a part equals the whole. "The distinctions between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, justice and injustice, are just as fixed and necessary as the distinction between a straight line and a curved line, or between body and space. The law of duty is just as fixed and as absolute as are the mathematical relations."* We speak of mathematical as eternal truths. The epithet is apt and just. There can be no contradiction and no alteration in them. They depend upon no arrangement of matter, upon no distribution of forces. Were there no heavens and no earth for their diagram, were there no created intelligences to demonstrate them, they would be the *same*. So we reason concerning moral distinctions. Their standard and reason are found in *eternal justice*. We can as easily conceive of a square ceasing to have angles, or a circle without a center, as we can conceive of moral distinctions as having a beginning, or

* Tappan.

that they can come to an end. They are normal and imperishable.

Moral distinctions are universal. They are the same in every case and to every being, so that when the same facts and relations are apprehended, the affirmations of conscience in all moral agents are the same.

The criterion or law by which a *necessary* moral principle is determined to be a *universal* principle is, *the impossibility of our not erecting it into a maxim of universal legislation.**

And inasmuch as the ideas of right and wrong *exist* in all rational minds, and have to all minds the *same* characteristics of being self-evident and necessary, and as each moral agent cannot but affirm that the same law which binds him *does* and *must* bind all other intelligents, it follows that *when the same facts and relations are apprehended, the same law, in its essential forms, must be known to, and bind the conscience of all moral beings.*

The human mind affirms *obligation*, not only for itself, but for all rational beings. Whatever I am bound in justice to render to my neighbor, is that which he is also bound to render unto me. Whatsoever I would that man should do unto me, that is what I am required to do unto him. My own moral judgments are but the echo of the conscience of the moral universe. Now, as the conscience of each moral agent legislates not only for itself, but for other intelligents, affirming with as much confidence what is *their* duty as what is its own, and as we cannot but feel that such is the conscience of every other moral agent, we have in this fact an explanation of the *universal* conviction and sentiment of moral accountability. "Every man knows—cannot but know—himself as accountable, not only at the bar of his own conscience, but of that of every other intelligent for his moral conduct."† We feel they have a right to inquire into the reasons of our conduct. When we have done right, we feel we have a right to the moral esteem of all intelligent beings; when we have done wrong, we feel the condemnation of our fellow-men is just.

Moral distinctions have then the characteristics of self-evident, necessary, and universal truth. Now, the ultimate ground of all moral judgments is *the fundamental ideas of the*

* Cousin: "True, Beautiful, and Good," page 300. † Mahan.

reason. A judgment is the affirmation of an agreement or disagreement. The subject and the predicate can only be compared by a middle term with which both must agree, or with which one agrees and the other disagrees. That middle term in the case before us must be an idea of pure reason, or, in other words, it must be native to all minds, because all minds affirm moral distinctions. If, then, moral distinctions are necessary and universal, the ideas of the just, the true, and the good, upon which they are based, must also be *universal;* they are native to all minds.

In opposition to the doctrine of the universality of moral distinctions and moral ideas, it is affirmed *that reason or conscience does not enounce a uniform suffrage;* its dictates are widely divergent, sometimes contradictory.

We are told by Mr. Watson that "so far as mere reason has applied itself to the discovery of duty it has *generally* gone astray." "There was *little agreement* among the sages of antiquity, even upon the first principles of morals." "The fundamental principles in morals . . . were either held *doubtfully*, or connected with some manifest absurdity, or utterly *denied* by the *wisest* moral teachers among the Gentiles who lived before the Christian revelation was given."* "There is," says Locke, "scarce that principle of morality to be named, or rule of virtue to be thought on, which is not somewhere or other slighted and condemned by the *general fashion* of whole societies of men, governed by practical opinions and rules of living quite opposite to each other." Paley affirms "there is scarce a single vice which in some age or country has not been countenanced by *public opinion.* In one country it is esteemed an office of piety in children to sustain aged parents, in another to dispatch them out of the way; suicide in one age of the world has been called heroism, in another felony; theft, which is punished by most laws, by the laws of Sparta was not unfrequently rewarded. You shall have dueling alternately reprobated and applauded, according to the sex, age, or station of the person you converse with: the forgiveness of insults and injuries is accounted by one sort of people magnanimity, by another meanness."† "One nation regards it as the greatest barbarity

* "Theological Institutes," vol. i, page 33.

† "Moral and Political Philosophy," book i, chap. v.

to hurt an infant, while infanticide was practiced and justified among the polite and civilized Athenians, and the Hindoo mother still sacrifices her infant to her idol god."* And because there is a diversity of *opinion* and of *action* among men, it is argued that *conscience is the mere creature of education, and there is no correct standard of right in the human mind.*

This mode of reasoning is not caricatured, but fairly stated in other words—because men have not uniformly practiced the right, therefore they have not had the idea of the *right;* inasmuch as men have not obeyed conscience, therefore conscience has not taught men what right is; because the sophist has prevaricated with conscience, and often suborned it to crime; because the clamors of passion have sometimes overborne and stifled the voice of conscience; because "public fashion" or "public opinion" in one country or age has been in favor of evil, therefore *conscience does not enounce a uniform suffrage! —its utterances are contradictory!*

We are led to wonder that it has never occurred to the minds of those who are perpetually employing this argument to disparage *conscience*—"the voice of God in man"—that this is precisely the mode of reasoning whereby sceptics are endeavoring to disparage *inspiration*—"the voice of God in Scripture."

They tell you there is scarce a crime which has not been committed in the name of religion, and scarcely a virtue enjoined in the Scriptures which has not, in one age or another, been slighted and disregarded by the public opinion or fashion of Christian nations. Men professing, believing, and teaching Christianity have been guilty of murder, infanticide, polygamy, adultery, and every other conceivable crime. Did not the Roman Catholic appeal to Scripture in proof that it was his solemn duty to persecute and burn all heretics? and did not he believe he was doing God service? Did not the Puritan seek for precedents to guide his ordinary conduct in the Books of Judges and of Kings, and sing with unwonted fervor the imprecatory Psalms? "The prophet who hewed in pieces a captive king; the rebel general who gave the blood of a queen to the dogs; the matron who, in defiance of plighted faith and of the laws of hospitality, drove the nail into the brain of the

* Smith's "Theory of Moral Sentiments," page 5, chap. ii.

fugitive ally who was sleeping under the shadow of her tent, were proposed as models to Christians suffering under the tyranny of princes and prelates."* Do not a large proportion of the Christians of this continent quote the Scriptures to prove that American slavery is a divine institution? and are not the ministers of the Southern Churches—men professing to be taught of God—praying for the success of the most diabolical rebellion that ever darkened human history? while other ministers are denouncing slavery, and anathematizing the rebellion in God's name, and on the authority of the same writings. Therefore, they argue, *the Bible does not enounce a uniform suffrage; the conclusions to which it leads men are palpably contradictory!*

Is, then, the Bible not an ultimate standard of *right*, even though many who profess to follow its teachings do not do *right?* because among Christians in different countries and ages there have been conflicting opinions as to what their duty was? Does not the Scripture clearly, unmistakably teach what *duty* is? You answer, with emphasis, YES! You say they who are pleading the Scriptures to sustain and defend injustice and wrong, are wresting and perverting and misinterpreting the Bible. They who profess to believe the Scriptures, and yet violate the rights of others, and trample on the claims of humanity, do so in opposition to the Bible. They are dishonoring and disobeying the word of God. They are bad men in spite of their faith. They know they are wrong, and yet do wrong. They love sin, and are determined to live in sin, and they are perpetually prevaricating with Scripture to array it on their side. True! And so we affirm that they who are doing wrong, and laboring to create a public opinion in favor of wrong, and are pleading a pretended dictum of conscience on the side of wrong, are doing so *against conscience.* The allegation that "the most flagrant crimes have been committed in the name of conscience" is only a parallel to the assertion that "the most flagrant crimes have been committed in the name of religion;" but this does not prove that conscience any more than that religion has approved and authorized these crimes. That a rule of virtue was slighted by the "general fashion" is no evidence that those who joined in the fashion did not still

* Macaulay.

know that it *was* a rule of virtue. There is "scarce a single vice which has not been countenanced by public opinion in some age or country;" but where is the proof that it has been approved by the inward monitor? Who can prove that in any age or nation the liar, the thief, the adulterer, the murderer believed he was *right*, or that reason in any age ever justified the complacential love of sin? There is a world of difference between the sentiments which men express in public and those which they entertain in private. The utterances of a man's lips, when put upon his own defense before his fellow-men, are very different to the verdicts of his own conscience in the moments of calm reflection. Suicide in one age has been heroism, in another cowardice; but it is not every action which a man pronounces heroic that he, in his conscience, believes to be *right*. "The polite and civilized Athenians, instead of censuring, justified infanticide by far-fetched considerations of public utility."* *Then, indeed, it needed justification! if they believed it right it needed none.* Why have recourse to arguments unless they were conscious it was morally wrong? The vices of theft and lying are *said* to have been legalized by the Lacedemonian Institute, (though much that is commonly believed of it rests upon tradition and myth, and not on veritable history.) It was deemed needful to a military training. It was justified as tending to expertness, and as encouraging concealment and secrecy.† "But to support this Spartan code, they must dethrone nature herself. It interdicted all the laws and sympathies of humanity. It annulled marriage. It took possession of offspring. It required, as a test of endurance, the self-infliction of the severest cruelties."‡ It was one grand conflict with God, nature, and conscience, and to carry it forward they had to "dissever man from antiquity, from internationality, from kindred, from philosophy, from instinct, and from every strong-

* Adam Smith.

† When theft was publicly rewarded in Sparta it was not because honesty was not deemed a virtue, but because patriotism was deemed a greater virtue, and therefore the dextrous robbery of an enemy was honored at the price of honesty, as a service rendered to the state.—Dr. Harris's "Man Primeval," page 135. (See Sir J. Mackintosh's "Dissertations," § 1. Also Dr. Brown's Lectures, vol. ii, pp. 240, 241. American edition.)

‡ Hamilton.

hold of his being," and then it failed utterly and ingloriously. The Hindoo mother has still the tenderness of a true mother when she sacrifices her infant to her idol god; but she is controlled by a mightier power than instinct or conscience—*her religious hopes and fears.* Her sense of guilt suggests the need of expiation, and she offers "the fruit of her body for the sin of her soul."

All these alleged instances of a variable and fluctuating standard of morals among men are therefore defective in one essential point. They fail to show that *when conscience has been allowed its simple exercise and native authority it has not universally condemned injustice and cruelty, and fostered righteousness and beneficence.* They show that the external conduct, and sometimes the conventional opinions of men, have varied from a uniform standard of right; but they do not prove that a uniform standard of right has not always existed among men. They prove that men have not always followed the teachings of conscience; but they do not prove that the moral judgment of mankind has ever approved the *wrong*, or that it was possible by any process of perversion or induration to bring men to believe that falsehood, robbery, adultery, homicide are *right.*

The grand error which vitiates all the reasoning of those who would disprove the existence, in all minds, of a uniform moral standard, is the tacit assumption that *necessary ideas of reason must act causally upon the will.* They seem to have taken for granted that if conscience had been uniform in its teaching, all men would have been uniform in their moral conduct. They argue that mankind have not uniformly chosen the right, therefore they have not had the idea of the right. But are we not all conscious that the voice of conscience may be overborne and drowned by the clamors of passion? A perverse and depraved will may, and does often choose evil in the midst of the clearest perceptions of right, and against the most solemn remonstrances of conscience. Hence the possibility of sin. Nay, a public opinion in favor of wrong may be created, and factitious circumstances may for a season give countenance to evil—a whole community may persistently practice iniquity, and outrage conscience until they become the dupes of falsehood and crime, and conscience may *appear* to be dead. But

in the most depraved and wicked, it is not utterly dead. They, even, who are abandoned of God, and "given over by him to a reprobate mind" . . . they "who are without understanding" . . . "without natural affection" . . . "*they know the judgment of God,*" that they who commit such things are *worthy* of death; not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."*

They who have become so fatuous may have disinherited the understanding and judgment of all that is true to them; but unless they have become idiotic, and *reason* is extinguished, they must affirm the distinction of right and wrong, and know that wrong is "worthy" of punishment. Amid surrounding circumstantial darkness, the depravity of the heathen could not be adjudged as "worthy of death," unless God had still his own witness in the consciences of men.

Another source of misapprehension on the part of those who assert that the moral standards among our race are uncertain and fluctuating, is in their *not distinguishing between necessary and contingent principles of morality.*

In so far as the motives and intentions by which a moral agent is to be governed are concerned, the principles of morality are under all circumstances, and to all beings, fixed and immutable. We are morally bound to *intend* that which is right, and to *will* the good of universal being. In regard to the *means* we employ to realize these intentions, they are *contingent*, and vary with the light enjoyed by different individuals, and by the same individuals at different times. Particular duties are also modified and determined by particular relations and circumstances; and amid the endless complications of circumstances, it is often difficult to decide what our duty is. Hence the possibility of *error*. The *motive*, which in reality determines the moral quality of every action, may be right; the *means* employed may be inadequate, or even subversive of the end proposed.

As in the law written on tables of stone, we have "universal principles which include and imply all particular and special duties;" so, also, in the law written upon the heart. In the light of these "universal principles," man has to determine his duty under all the varying circumstances and relations of his

* See Romans i, 21–32.

earthly existence. We may err in the application of these principles, but we cannot fail to recognize the principles themselves as rules of conduct.

Now to affirm that men have no native, fundamental ideas of the just and good, because, amid the varying circumstances of life and collisions of duties, they have erred in the application of these standards of right, is just as erroneous as the assertion that there are no universal principles of right enounced in the Scriptures because Christians have often misinterpreted and misapplied them.

The affirmation that the moral standards among our race are fluctuating and variable is in conflict with all facts and all evidence.

In spite of all the topical moralities to which factitious circumstances may have given birth, there is an unquestionable, *universal morality.* In every nation under heaven, Veracity, Justice, Beneficence are separated by a clear, unmistakable line from Falsehood, Injustice, and Cruelty; nor can all the casuistry and sophistry in the universe transpose or confound them. Custom, prescription, conversions of human opinion, factitious circumstances can never blur over and obliterate these lines. Beneath all these, conscience will make her voice to be heard in the inmost depths of the soul, in the common sentiments of mankind, and in the statutes of universal jurisprudence. The great ideas of Justice and Right were prominent and well defined among the nations of antiquity. "Nemesis and Themis were not only their abstractions and deities; they were embodied in their systems of jurisprudence. Law secured property and sanctified life. Law guarded every relation and ordered every act. Law was the theme of their philosophy, and the burden of their song. We are not unacquainted with the jealousies and disputes of their schools of philosophy. They placed the good of man and the reason of morality in the most incongruous things, but they *never differed concerning the conduct which was right.* Epicurus and Zeno knew no divergence here.* The assertion that unassisted reason cannot furnish us a knowledge of duty, and of the immutable distinctions between right and wrong, is con-

* Richard Winter Hamilton, page 57: "Revealed Doctrine of Future Rewards and Punishments."

futed by the existence of Aristotle's "Treatise on Ethics," "the Institutes of Menu,"* and the moral teachings of the "Bhagvat Geeta."† The testimony of Cicero is conclusive as to the perception, by all minds, of an immutable morality. "There is one true and original law, *conformable to nature and reason*, diffused over all, invariable, eternal, which calls to the fulfillment of duty and to abstinence from injustice, and which calls with that irresistible voice which is felt in all its authority when it is heard. This law cannot be abolished, curtailed, nor affected in its sanctions by any law of man. A whole senate, a whole people cannot dispense with its paramount obligation. It requires no commentator to render it distinctly intelligible, nor is it different at Rome, at Athens now, and in the ages before and after; but in all ages, and in all nations, it is, and has been, and will be, one and everlasting—one as that God, its great author and promulgator, is one."‡

Among the most savage, as among the most refined and polished nations, are also to be found the common rules of morality. Theft, adultery, murder, are offenses condemned and punished by every nation under heaven. The high qualities of virtue are the things which win esteem and command reverence in every country however rude. The quotation of authorities on this point is needless. Were we asked for proof, we would go straight to the darkest corner of the earth at once. The Fijian regards theft, adultery, abduction, incendiarism, and treason as serious crimes.§

If, then, moral distinctions are self-evident, necessary, and universal, they are not the *creations of mere law;* they are not the result of Divine legislation. The will of God did not call them into being, and therefore the *ground of obligation* to govern ourselves by them is not to be found in the *Divine will.*

"God is no more the creator of *virtue* than he is of truth. Justice and benevolence were virtues previous to the forthputting of will or jurisprudence on his part. They had a subsistence and a character before that any creatures were made

* See the Life of Sir James Mackintosh.

† Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. xvi, pp. 788, 805.

‡ Lucani Pharsalia, Lib. ix, v. Translated by Dr. Brown. Philosophy, vol. ii, page 251.

§ See "Fiji and the Fijians," page 22.

who could be the subjects of a will or a government at all. He no more ordained them to be virtues than he ordained that the three angles of a triangle should be equal to two right angles. The moral and the mathematical propositions have been alike the objects of Divine perception and of Divine approval from all eternity; and he no more willed the *rightness* of the one, and the *reality* of the other, than he willed himself into being, or willed what should be the virtues of his own character, or the ideas of his own reason."* Moral distinctions are, therefore, uncreated and eternal—the necessary development of the uncreated and eternal reason. Virtue has an inherent and essential rightness of its own, and God wills it *because* it is right.

The Divine will is the fountain of efficiency; *the Divine reason is the fountain of law.* Free-will is universally the subject and not the foundation of obligation. In the Divine reason must therefore be found the *ground of all moral obligation.* And as the human reason is the outbirth and image of the Divine, so its affirmations are the highest authority to man. *The voice of conscience is the voice of God.* There can be no higher authority in morals. It speaks more immediately and directly to the human heart than the voice of any prophet or seer.

The necessary affirmations of the moral faculty are assumed as the *reason* of obligation. When the particular relation, in view of which a particular duty is affirmed, is apprehended, whether it be a duty toward God, individual man, or society, all the *reason* that can be assigned has been given why that duty is binding upon us. *We have then discovered the only real and ultimate foundation of all obligation.*

We flatter ourselves we have now cleared our pathway to the field of Moral Science, and may be permitted, in another short article, to mark out its legitimate boundaries, and gather up some of its precious fruits.

*Chalmers' Institutes, vol. i.

Art. II.—THE SAINTS OF THE DESERT: ST. ANTHONY OF EGYPT, AND SYMEON THE STYLITE.

Christian monasticism arose in the fourth century on the basis of the earlier asceticism, which can be traced to the apostolic age, and even beyond to the Essenes in Palestine and Therapeutæ in Egypt. It was an attempt to save the virgin purity of the Church, now united with the State since Constantine, by carrying it into the wilderness, and to strike out a safer way to holiness and salvation by withdrawing from the world and its temptations, and by cultivating exclusively the virtues of humility, chastity, and self-denial in unbroken communion with God. It spread with astonishing rapidity all over the Christian world, became one of the leading institutions in the Greek and Roman Church, and exerted for many centuries down to the Reformation, and even to the present time, a powerful influence for good and evil upon the Church and the world.

The first known Christian hermit, as distinct from the earlier ascetics, who lived in the midst of the Church, is the fabulous Paul of Thebes, in Upper Egypt. In the twenty-second year of his age, during the Decian persecution, A. D. 250, he retired to a distant cave, grew fond of solitude, and lived there, according to the legend, ninety years in a grotto near a spring and a palm-tree, which furnished him food, shade, and clothing until his death, in 340. In his later years a raven is said to have brought him daily half a loaf, as the ravens ministered to Elijah. But no one knew of this wonderful saint till Anthony, who under a higher impulse visited and buried him, made him known to the world. At this singular visit the raven brought a double portion of bread, and at the burial two lions of the desert assisted Anthony of their own accord, digging a grave in the sand. So says, in good earnest, the learned Jerome some thirty years afterward, as it appears, on the authority of Amathus and Macarius, two disciples of Anthony. But this and similar traditions he opens to suspicion by the remark in the prologue to his life of Paul of Thebes, that many incredible things are said of him which are not worthy of repetition.

In this Paul we have an example of a canonized saint who lived ninety years unseen and unknown in the wilderness, beyond all fellowship with the visible Church, without Bible, public worship, or sacraments, and so died, yet is supposed to have attained the highest grade of piety. How does this consist with the common doctrine of the Catholic Church respecting the necessity and the operation of the means of grace? Augustine, blinded by the ascetic spirit of his age, says even that anchorets on their level of perfection may dispense with the Bible. Certain it is that this kind of perfection stands not in the Bible, but outside of it.

The proper founder of the hermit life, the one chiefly instrumental in giving it its prevalence, was ST. ANTHONY of Egypt. He is the most celebrated, the most original, and the most venerable representative of this abnormal and eccentric sanctity, the patriarch of monks, and the childless father of an innumerable seed. Anthony sprang from a Christian and honorable Coptic family, and was born about 251 at Conia, on the borders of the Thebiad. Naturally quiet, contemplative, and reflective, he avoided the society of playmates, and despised all higher learning. He understood only his Coptic vernacular, and remained all his life ignorant of Grecian literature and secular science. But he diligently attended divine worship with his parents, and so carefully heard the Scripture lessons that he retained them in memory. Memory was his library. He afterward made faithful, but only too literal use of single passages of Scripture, and began his discourse to the hermits with the very uncatholic-sounding declaration, "The holy Scriptures give us instruction enough." In his eighteenth year, about 270, the death of his parents devolved on him the care of a younger sister and a considerable estate. Six months afterward he heard in the church, just as he was meditating on the apostles' implicit following of Jesus, the word of the Lord to the rich young ruler: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me." This word was the voice of God, which determined his life. He divided his real estate, consisting of three hundred acres of fertile land, among the inhabitants of the village, and sold his personal property for the benefit of the poor, excepting a moderate

reserve for the support of his sister. But when soon afterward he heard in the church the exhortation, "Take no thought for the morrow," he distributed the remnant to the poor, and intrusted his sister to a society of pious virgins. He visited her only once after, a characteristic fact for the ascetic depreciation of natural ties.

He then forsook the hamlet and led an ascetic life in the neighborhood, praying constantly according to the exhortation, "Pray without ceasing;" and also laboring according to the maxim, "If any will not work, neither should he eat." What he did not need for his slender support he gave to the poor. He visited the neighboring ascetics, who were then already very plentiful in Egypt, to learn humbly and thankfully their several eminent virtues: from one, earnestness in prayer: from another, watchfulness; from a third, excellence in fasting: from a fourth, meekness; from all, love to Christ and to fellow-men. Thus he made himself universally beloved, and came to be reverenced as a friend of God. But to reach a still higher level of ascetic holiness, he retreated, after the year 285, further and further from the bosom and vicinity of the Church into solitude, and thus became the founder of anchoretism or hermit life, strictly so called. At first he lived in a sepulcher; then for twenty years in the ruins of a castle; and last on Mount Colzim, some seven hours from the Red Sea, a three days' journey east of the Nile, where an old cloister still preserves his name and memory.

In this solitude he prosecuted his ascetic practices with ever-increasing vigor. The monotony was broken only by basket-making, occasional visits, and battles with the devil. In fasting he attained a rare abstemiousness. His food consisted of bread and salt, sometimes dates; his drink of water. Flesh and wine he never touched. He ate only once a day, generally after sunset, and like the presbyter Isidore, was ashamed that an immortal spirit should need earthly nourishment. Often he fasted from two to five days. Friends and wandering Saracens, who always had a certain reverence for the saints of the desert, brought him bread from time to time. But in the last years of his life, to render himself entirely independent of others, and to afford hospitality to travelers, he cultivated a small garden on the mountain, near a spring shaded by palms.

Sometimes the wild beasts of the forest destroyed his modest harvest, till he drove them away forever with the expostulation, "Why do you injure me, who never have done you the slightest harm? Away with you all, in the name of the Lord, and never come into my neighborhood again." He slept on bare ground, or at best on a pallet of straw; but often he watched the whole night through in prayer. The anointing of the body with oil he despised, and in later years never washed his feet, as if filthiness was an essential element of ascetic perfection. His whole wardrobe consisted of a hair shirt, a sheepskin, and a girdle. But notwithstanding all, he had a winning friendliness and cheerfulness in his face.

Conflicts with the devil and his hosts of demons were, as with other solitary saints, a prominent part of Anthony's experience, and continued through all his life. The devil appeared to him in visions and dreams, or even in daylight, in all possible forms; now as a friend, now as a fascinating woman, now as a dragon, tempting him by reminding him of his former wealth, of his noble family, of the care due to his sister; by promises of wealth, honor, and renown; by exhibitions of the difficulty of virtue and the facility of vice; by unchaste thoughts and images; by terrible threatenings of the dangers and punishments of the ascetic life. Once he struck the hermit so violently, Athanasius says, that a friend, who brought him bread, found him on the ground apparently dead. At another time he broke through the walls of his cave and filled the room with roaring lions, howling wolves, growling bears, fierce hyenas, crawling serpents, and scorpions; but Anthony turned manfully toward the monsters, till a supernatural light broke in from the roof and dispersed them. His sermon, which he delivered to the hermits at their request, treats principally of these wars with demons, and gives also the key to the interpretation of them. "Fear not Satan and his angels," he said; "Christ has broken their power. The best weapon against them is faith and piety. The presence of evil spirits reveals itself in perplexity, despondency, hatred of the ascetics, evil desires, fear of death. They take the form answering to the spiritual state they find in us at the time. They are the reflex of our thoughts and fantasies. If thou art carnally minded, thou art their prey; but if thou rejoicest in the Lord and occu-

piest thyself with divine things they are powerless. The devil is afraid of fasting, of prayer, of humility and good works. His illusions soon vanish where one arms himself with the sign of the cross."

Only in exceptional cases did Anthony leave his solitude, and then he made a powerful impression on both Christians and heathens with his hairy dress and his emaciated, ghost-like form. In the year 311, during the persecution under Maximinus, he appeared in Alexandria, in the hope of himself gaining the martyr's crown. He visited the confessors in the mines and prisons, encouraged them before the tribunal, accompanied them to the scaffold; but no one ventured to lay hands on the saint of the wilderness. In the year 351, when a hundred years old, he showed himself for the second and last time in the metropolis of Egypt to bear witness for the orthodox faith of his friend Athanasius against Arianism, and in a few days converted more heathen and heretics than had otherwise been gained in a whole year. He declared the Arian denial of the divinity of Christ worse than the venom of the serpent, and no better than heathenism, which worshiped the creature instead of the Creator. He would have nothing to do with heretics, and warned his disciples against intercourse with them. Athanasius attended him to the gate of the city, where he cast out an evil spirit from a girl. An invitation to stay longer in Alexandria he declined, saying, "As a fish out of water, so a monk out of his solitude dies." Imitating his example, the monks afterward forsook the wilderness in swarms whenever orthodoxy was in danger, and went in long processions, with wax tapers and responsive singing, through the streets, or appeared at the councils to contend for the orthodox faith with all the energy of fanaticism, often even with physical force.

Though Anthony shunned the society of men, yet he was frequently visited in his solitude and resorted to for consolation and aid by Christians and heathens, by ascetics, sick and needy, as a heaven-descended physician of Egypt for body and soul. He enjoined prayer, labor, and care of the poor; exhorted those at strife to the love of God, and healed the sick and demoniac with his prayer. Athanasius relates several miracles performed by him, the truth of which we leave undecided, though they are far less incredible and absurd than many other monkish

stories of that age. Anthony, his biographer assures us, never boasted when his prayer was heard, nor murmured when it was not, but in either case thanked God. He cautioned monks against overrating the gift of miracles, since it is not our work, but the grace of the Lord; and he reminded them of the word, "Rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven." To Martianus, an officer, who urgently besought him to heal his possessed daughter, he said, "Man, why dost thou call on me? I am a man, as thou art. If thou believest, pray to God, and he will hear thee." Martianus prayed, and on his return found his daughter whole.

Anthony distinguished himself above most of his countless disciples and successors by his fresh originality of mind. Though uneducated and contracted, he had sound sense and ready mother-wit. Many of his striking answers and felicitous sentences have come down to us. When some heathen philosophers once visited him, he asked them, "Why do you give yourselves so much trouble to see a fool?" They explained, perhaps ironically, that they took him rather for a wise man. He replied, "If you take me for a fool, your labor is lost; but if I am a wise man you should imitate me, and be Christians as I am." At another time, when taunted with his ignorance, he asked, "Which is older and better, mind or learning?" The mind, was the answer. "Then," said the hermit, "the mind can do without learning." "My book," he remarked on a similar occasion, "is the whole creation, which lies open before me, and in which I can read the word of God as often as I will." The blind Church teacher, Didymus, whom he met in Alexandria, he comforted with the words, "Trouble not thyself for the loss of the outward eye, with which even flies see; but rejoice in the possession of the spiritual eye, with which also angels behold the face of God and receive his light." Even the Emperor Constantine, with his sons, wrote to him as a spiritual father, and begged an answer from him. The hermit at first would not so much as receive the letter, since in any case, being unable to write, he could not answer it, and cared as little for the great of this world as Diogenes for Alexander. When told that the emperor was a Christian, he dictated the answer: "Happy thou, that thou worshipest Christ.

A 706195

Be not proud of thy earthly power. Think of the future judgment, and know that Christ is the only true and eternal king. Practice justice and love for men, and care for the poor." To his disciples he said on this occasion, "Wonder not that the emperor writes to me, for he is a man. Wonder much more that God has written the law for man, and has spoken to us by his own Son."

During the last years of his life the patriarch of monasticism withdrew as much as possible from the sight of visitors, but allowed two disciples to live with him, and to take care of him in his infirm old age. When he felt his end approaching he commanded them not to embalm his body, according to the Egyptian custom, but to bury it in the earth, and keep the spot of his interment secret. One of his two sheep-skins he bequeathed to the Bishop Serapion; the other, with his undergarment, to Athanasius, who had once given it to him new, and now received it back, worn out and loaded with honor. What became of the robe woven from palm leaves, which, according to Jerome, he had inherited from Paul of Thebes, and wore at Easter and Pentecost, Athanasius does not tell us. After this disposition of his property Anthony said to his disciples, "Children, farewell; for Anthony goes away, and will be no more with you." With these words he stretched out his feet and expired with a smiling face, in the year 356, a hundred and five years old. His grave remained for centuries unknown. His last will was thus a protest against the worship of saints and relics, which, however, it nevertheless greatly helped to promote. Under Justinian, in 561, his bones, as the Bollandists and Butler minutely relate, were miraculously discovered, brought to Alexandria, then to Constantinople, and at last to Vienna, in South France; and in the eleventh century, during the raging of an epidemic disease—the so-called holy fire, or St. Anthony's fire—they are said to have performed great wonders.

Athanasius, the greatest man of the Nicene age, concludes his biography of his friend with this sketch of his character: "From this short narrative you may judge how great a man Anthony was, who persevered in the ascetic life from youth to the highest age. In his advanced age he never allowed himself better food nor change of raiment, nor did he even wash his feet. Yet he continued healthy in all his parts. His eyesight

was clear to the end, and his teeth sound, though by long use worn to mere stumps. He retained also the perfect use of his hands and feet, and was more robust and vigorous than those who are accustomed to a change of food and clothing and to washing. His fame spread from his remote dwelling on the lone mountain over the whole Roman empire. What gave him his renown was not learning, nor worldly wisdom, nor human art, but alone his piety toward God. And let all the brethren know that the Lord will not only take holy monks to heaven, but give them celebrity in all the earth, however deep they may bury themselves in the wilderness."

The whole Nicene age venerated in Anthony a model saint. This fact brings out most characteristically the vast difference between the ancient and the modern, the old Catholic and the evangelical Protestant conception of the nature of Christian religion. The specifically Christian element in the life of Anthony, especially as measured by the Pauline standard, is very small. Nevertheless we can but admire the miserable magnificence, the simple, rude grandeur of this hermit sanctity, even in its aberration. Anthony concealed under his sheep-skin a child-like humility, an amiable simplicity, a rare energy of will, and a glowing love to God, which maintained itself for almost ninety years in the absence of all the comforts and pleasures of natural life, and triumphed over all the temptations of the flesh. By piety alone, without the help of education or learning, he became one of the most remarkable and influential men in the history of the ancient Church.

Even heathen cotemporaries could not withhold from him their reverence, and the celebrated philosopher Synesius, afterward a bishop, before his conversion reckoned Anthony among those rare men in whom flashes of thought take the place of reasonings, and natural power of mind makes schooling needless.

The example of Anthony acted like magic upon his generation, and his biography by Athanasius, which was soon translated also into Latin, was a tract for the times. Chrysostom, the prince of ancient preachers, recommended it to all as instructive and edifying reading. Even Augustine, the most evangelical of the fathers, was powerfully affected by the read-

ing of it in his decisive religious struggles, and was decided by it in his entire renunciation of the world.

In a short time, still in the lifetime of Anthony, the deserts of Egypt, from Nitria, south of Alexandria and the wilderness of Scetis, to Lybia and the Thebiad, were peopled with anchorets and studded with cells. A mania for monasticism possessed Christendom, and seized the people of all classes like an epidemic. As martyrdom had formerly been, so now monasticism was, the quickest and surest way to renown upon earth and to eternal reward in heaven. This prospect, with which Athanasius concludes his life of Anthony, abundantly recompensed all self-denial, and mightily stimulated pious ambition. The consistent recluse must continually increase his seclusion. No desert was too scorching, no rock too forbidding, no cliff too steep, no cave too dismal for the feet of these world-hating and man-shunning enthusiasts. It has been supposed that in Egypt the number of anchorets and monks equaled the population of the cities! The natural contrast between the desert and the fertile valley of the Nile was reflected in the moral contrast between the monastic life and the world.

It is unnecessary to recount the lives of all the leading anchorets, since the same features, even to unimportant details, repeat themselves in all. But in the fifth century a new and quite original path was broken by SYMEON, the father of the STYLITES, or pillar-saints, who spent long years, day and night, summer and winter, rain and sunshine, frost and heat, standing on high unsheltered pillars in prayer and penances, and made the way to heaven for themselves so passing hard, that one knows not whether to wonder at their unexampled self-denial, or to pity their ignorance of the Gospel salvation. On this giddy height the anchoretic asceticism reached its completion.

ST. SYMEON THE STYLITE, originally a shepherd on the borders of Syria and Cilicia, when a boy of thirteen years was powerfully affected by the beatitudes which he heard read in the church, and betook himself to a cloister. He lay several days without eating or drinking before the threshold, and begged to be admitted as the meanest servant of the house. He accustomed himself to eat only once a week, on Sunday. During Lent he even went through the whole forty days without

any food; a fact almost incredible, even for a tropical climate. The first attempt of this kind brought him to the verge of death; but his constitution conformed itself, and when Theodoret visited him he had solemnized six-and-twenty Lent seasons by total abstinence, and thus surpassed Moses, Elias, and even Christ, who never fasted so but once! Another of his extraordinary inflictions was to lace his body so tightly that the cord pressed through to his bones, and could be cut off only with the most terrible pains. This occasioned his dismissal from the cloister.

He afterward spent some time as a hermit upon a mountain with an iron chain upon his feet, and was visited there by admiring and curious throngs.

When this failed to satisfy him, he invented, in 423, a new sort of holiness, and lived some two days' journey (forty miles) east of Antioch, for six-and-thirty years, until his death upon a pillar, which at last was nearly forty cubits high; for the pillar was raised in proportion as he approached heaven and perfection. Here he could never lie or sit, but only stand or lean upon a post, probably a banister, or devoutly bow, in which last position he almost touched his feet with his head, so flexible had his back been made by fasting. A spectator once counted in one day no less than twelve hundred and forty-four such genuflexions of the saint before the Almighty, and then gave up counting. He wore a covering of the skins of beasts, and a chain about his neck. Even the holy sacrament he took upon his pillar. People streamed from afar to witness this standing wonder of the age. He spoke to all classes with the same friendliness, mildness, and love; only women he never suffered to come within the walls which surrounded his pillar.

From this original pulpit, as a mediator between heaven and earth, he preached repentance twice a day to the astonished spectators, settled controversies, vindicated the orthodox faith, extorted laws even from an emperor, healed the sick, wrought miracles, and converted thousands of heathen Ishmaelites, Iberians, Armenians, and Persians to Christianity, or at least to the Christian name.

All this the celebrated Theodoret relates as an eye-witness during the lifetime of the saint. He terms him the great wonder of the world, and compares him to a candle on a candle-

stick, and to the sun itself, which sheds its rays on every side. He asks the objector to this mode of life to consider that God often uses very striking means to arouse the negligent, as the history of the prophets show; and concludes his narrative with the remark, "Should the saint live longer he may do yet greater wonders, for he is a universal ornament and honor to religion."

He died in 459, in the sixty-ninth year of his age, of a long-concealed and loathsome ulcer on his leg, and his body was brought in solemn procession to the metropolitan Church of Antioch.

Even before his death Symeon enjoyed the unbounded admiration of Christians and heathens, of the common people, of the kings of Persia, and the emperors Theodosius II., Leo, and Marcian, who begged his blessing and his counsel. No wonder that, with his renowned humility, he had to struggle with the temptations of spiritual pride. Once an angel appeared to him in a vision, with a chariot of fire to convey him, like Elijah, to heaven, because the blessed spirits longed for him. He was already stepping into the chariot with his right foot, which on this occasion he sprained, (as Jacob his thigh,) when the phantom of Satan was chased away by the sign of the cross. Perhaps this incident, which the *Acta Sanctorum* gives, was afterward invented to account for his sore, and to illustrate the danger of self-conceit. Hence also the pious monk Nilus, with good reason, reminded the ostentatious pillar-saints of the proverb, "He that exalteth himself shall be abased."

Of the later Stylites the most distinguished were Daniel, (died 490,) in the vicinity of Constantinople, and Symeon the Younger, (died 592,) in Syria. The latter is said to have spent sixty-eight years on a pillar. In the East this form of sanctity perpetuated itself, though only in exceptional cases, down to the twelfth century. The West, so far as we know, affords but one example of a Stylite who, according to Gregory of Tours, lived a long time on a pillar near Treves, but came down at the command of the bishop and entered a neighboring cloister.

With all due admiration for the extraordinary moral heroism displayed by these ancient hermits, it is no recommendation to it that it is without any authority in the Scriptures of truth.

Christ and the apostles never enjoined such excesses either by precept or example. On the other hand, the history of ancient and modern Hindoo asceticism furnish similar phenomena in connection with a false religion. Some of these heathen devotees, we are told by travelers, bury themselves in pits with only small breathing holes at the top; while others, disdaining to touch the vile earth beneath, live in iron cages suspended from trees. Some wear heavy iron collars or fetters, or drag a heavy chain, fastened by one end round their privy parts, to give ostentatious proof of their chastity. Others keep their fists hard shut, until their finger nails grow through the palms of their hands. Some stand perpetually on one leg; others keep their faces turned over one shoulder, until they cannot turn them back again. Some lie on wooden beds, bristling all over with iron spikes; others are fastened for life to the trunk of a tree by a chain, like Symeon to his pillar. Some suspend themselves for half an hour at a time, feet uppermost, or with a hook thrust through their naked backs, over a hot fire. A Jesuit missionary describes a Hindoo saint who had his body inclosed in an iron cage, with his head and feet outside, so that he could walk, but neither sit nor lie down; at night his pious attendants attached a hundred lighted lamps to the outside of the cage, so that their master could exhibit himself walking as the mock-light of the world!

It is impossible to read of these self-imposed penances and sufferings without profound gratitude to Christ, who, in the Gospel, opened to all penitent and believing sinners such a plain and sure road to salvation; and to the Reformers of the sixteenth century, who cleared this road of the many obstructions erected by the pious folly of men in the vain attempt to save themselves.

Art. III.—THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN.

Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man. By Sir Charles Lyell, F.R.S. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1863.

The recent discoveries of fossil human remains, and the works of human art found in company with the bones of extinct species of animals, and the presentation of these to the public, together with old facts under new views and new relations, have awakened a lively interest in the question of the antiquity of the human race. The long general acquiescence in the chronology which fixed the limits of man's existence upon the earth to less than seven thousand years has been rather rudely startled by the claims made in some cases for a human antiquity that makes the life of man reach vastly and indefinitely beyond the dates agreed upon for the biblical chronology. The extreme men of the high antiquity school are understood as claiming for the duration of the age of man a period of time as measureless in centuries as the great geological ages, and compared with which the earliest dates of the commonly received historic times are but of yesterday. Others, however, more moderate and precise, claim only from ten to thirty thousand years. But in both cases the definite measurement of the years and centuries of primitive history have been effaced, and the origin of man and his early history pushed back so far beyond all precise periods and positive dates that the pre-historic time has become as indefinite in its duration as the Molluscan, Carboniferous, or Reptilian ages. That pre-historic time has passed into the great time-ratios of geological history in which positive times are exchanged for a succession of periods, and the absolute lengths of centuries for mere relative lengths of epochs. The Age of Man has been extended backward, and he himself made cotemporary with extinct races of gigantic quadrupeds that flourished before the New England rivers had scooped their broad river flats into marginal terraces.

These claims demand attention, and should be considered on scientific grounds, and either confirmed, denied, or withheld on scientific evidence, for they are put forward by earnest, sincere men, and men too devoted to somewhat different lines of study.

The geologist, the zoologist, antiquarian, and historian now may find themselves in the same sphere of investigation, and inquiring on the same subject: namely, Man and his age upon the earth. And the memorials of man thus furnished have a twofold bearing: the one bearing on his original condition, his customs, manners, mode of life and historic changes; the other on the tracing of the signs of his existence back into periods remote from the received chronology.

These fossil remains of man, comprising bones, implements of stone and flint; bits of wood, bone, or stone marked by tools; pottery, bronze and iron implements, lake dwellings, offal remains, are valuable contributions to history. They give large promise of help in filling up some of the blanks of primitive human records; of converting myths and traditions into veritable history; of supplying some of the links of that chain of human progress which we call civilization. As we look upon these ancient memorials of our ancestors, rude men of our own blood, our hearts are moved by the emotions of a common life, as in a clear imagination we gather with them to their crude feasts of fish and fowl and beast and grain; at their places of sepulture of their dead, honored by the living with the gift of weapons and viands to serve them in the spirit-land; on their lake dwellings, clustering a distance from the shore into a village, like a faint primeval type of splendid medieval Venice; at work with fire and stone tools shaping canoes, and then exchanging, in the progress of time, these implements of stone for those of bronze and iron. The geologist and antiquarian are writing human history, and the time is at hand when the writer of ancient history must deal no less with the conclusions of natural science than with traditions and the results of philology in determining the old races of man and their history.

But it is the attempt to place the creation of man in a period anterior to the Biblical Chronology about which we are at present concerned, and of which we propose a brief *résumé* both as to the facts themselves and the interpretation of these facts as given us in the present condition of the question.

THE DANISH PEAT AND SHELL MOUNDS—SWISS LAKE DWELLINGS.

The deposits of peat in Denmark vary in depth from ten to thirty feet, and in it at various depths lie trunks of trees, some

now natives of Denmark, others not. Among the trees not now native and buried in the peat-mosses is the Scotch fir, (*pinus sylvestris.*) This Scotch fir was afterward supplanted by the sessile variety of the common oak, and this oak in its turn by the common beech. This beech alone belongs to historical times, and yet it is supposed that the human period extended back to the times when the Scotch fir grew along the borders of the peat-mosses, for a stone implement of man's make was found buried in the peat below a trunk of the Scotch fir. If the stone implement lies exactly where it was lost, then the human period reaches backward through the many centuries required for the formation of the beds of peat, and the exchanges of the fir for the oak and of that for the beech.

Another class of human memorials are the Shell mounds, "Kitchen-refuse-heaps," (Kjökkenmödding,) found along the shores of nearly all the Danish Islands. These mounds contain the shells of the oyster, cockle, and other mollusks, mixed up with the bones of quadrupeds, (but not of extinct species,) birds, and fish, and scattered through these are "flint knives, hatchets, and other instruments of stone, bone, horn, and wood, with fragments of coarse pottery mixed with charcoal and cinders, but never any implements of bronze, still less of iron." The stone hatchets and knives have been sharpened by rubbing. The mounds are from three to ten feet high, and some of them one thousand feet long and from one hundred and fifty to two hundred wide, and are always near the shore. The proofs that these mounds are of considerable antiquity are, first, they are not found on those parts of the coast of the Western Ocean where the waves are slowly eating away the land; secondly, the shells, as of the oyster, cockle, and mussel, are of the size which they now have in the ocean, whereas the same species now met with in the adjoining parts of the Baltic have only a third of the ancient size, being stunted by the quantity of fresh water poured by the rivers into the Baltic; hence the inference that in the days of these eaters the ocean had a freer access to the Baltic than at present. Such a fact carries us back of known historical record.

Still another class of human memorials are the ancient dwellings built on piles in the shallow parts of many Swiss lakes, where to this day, under favorable circumstances, the wooden

piles may still be seen. These have once supported villages of an unknown date, but most of them belonged to the age of stone implements, for hundreds of these implements, resembling those of the Danish peat mosses and shell mounds, have been dredged up from the mud in which the piles are driven. Such instruments are axes, hammers, celts; and among other remains are pieces of rude pottery, fishing tackle, such as bits of cord and hooks made of bone; masses of charred wood, probably the timbers on which the cabins were built, and which were probably destroyed by fire. In western and central Switzerland, however, the implements are of bronze, and the piles themselves are not so much decayed as those where the stone implements are found. The number of these lake dwellings where the bronze implements are found is upward of seventy.

One historical use of the study of these remains of human workmanship and customs, whether found in the sand dunes on the coast, in shell-mounds in Irish and Swiss lakes, in peat-beds and in alluvial and other formation, has been the establishment for Western Europe of the chronological succession of periods styled the Ages of Stone, of Bronze, and of Iron, and named from the material of the implements in use by the natives.* But from the fact that these implements of stone have as yet been found in central and northern Europe, and not in Asia, the terms Age of Stone and of Bronze properly belong as yet only to the history of Europe.

Certain archæologists and geologists have endeavored to give positive dates to the Ages of Stone and Bronze. The Stone Age reaches back about, but not over seven thousand years. The most elaborate calculation to estimate definitely in years the antiquity of the bronze and stone periods is that made by M. Morlot respecting the delta of the Tinière, a torrent flowing into the Lake of Geneva near Villeneuve. This small delta is in the shape of a flattened cone, having a regular internal structure containing three layers of vegetable soil, each of which must once have formed the surface of the cone. The first layer is five inches thick and four feet below the surface, and contains Roman tiles and coin, and hence belongs to the Roman period. The second layer is six inches thick, and ten feet from the surface, and contains fragments of unvarnished pottery and

* Lyell's Antiquity of Man, chap. ii.

instruments of bronze, and hence belongs to the Bronze period. The third layer is about six inches thick and nineteen feet from the surface, and in it were found rude pottery, pieces of charcoal, broken bones, and hence classed from these and other remains with the Stone period. M. Morlot, assuming the Roman period to represent an antiquity of from sixteen to eighteen hundred years, and by the simple calculation of times proportionate to the depths below the surface, assigns to the Bronze period a date of about three thousand five hundred years, and to the Stone period between five thousand and seven thousand years. Besides this chronological computation, others have been made which agree in the main with this one of M. Morlot.

But this antiquity of the Stone period, as determined by the antiquity of the Roman period, is too great. For there is a strange historico-antiquarian assumption in this case in regard to the Roman remains found in the fluviatile drift, and which had been washed down into the delta from the ruins of some Roman buildings. The river and its delta lying on the eastern side of Lake Geneva, the Roman ruins would much more naturally date from the decline of the Roman power and customs than from the time of their active controlling occupancy, and the buildings, whatever they were, would most naturally fall into decay, and the tiles thus be subject to be washed by floods down into the delta at the time of this decline. Now Villeneuve is near the southern border of ancient Helvetia, and up to the fifth century Roman language, habits, and manners prevailed in this region. Nor would there be a probability of such structural ruins until after 496 A. D., when the Franks took possession of the country, and the old inhabitants lost their nationality and became the serfs or subjects of their more northern Frankish conquerors. We may then assume for the date of the dilapidation of the Roman buildings from 500 to 600 A. D. Assuming this date from which to calculate the age of the Stone period, we have the average proportionate to the dates taken by Morlot from 4000 to 5000; or at an average, 2500 B. C. This brings the Stone age down to the historic traditions of early European times. And if in addition to this we suppose that the first formations were much more rapidly formed than the later ones, which we are entitled to do,

from the physical description given by the term "flattened cone-shaped delta," there will be no noticeable disagreement with the common chronology. Moreover, if we accept the Septuagint chronology, which we prefer for many reasons to the Usherian one, and thereby add at least six hundred years to our time before Christ, then all difficulty whatever vanishes, and these human remains and memorials are nothing more than elucidations of the early history of our race, in nowise disagreeing with its commonly accepted antiquity.

THE ALLUVIAL PLAIN OF THE NILE.

Some years ago shafts were sunk and borings made in the land of Egypt through the Nile mud. These borings penetrated to the depth of seventy feet and less, and in numerous cases pieces of burnt brick and pottery were brought up from sixty to seventy feet below the surface. The average increase of Nile mud formed from the sedimentary deposit during the annual inundation has been estimated vaguely at from two and one-fourth to six inches a century, which would give us the existence of an Egyptian people from twelve thousand to thirty thousand years ago. Here in this land of myths we have a proposed antiquity to which the European Stone period is quite modern, and which reaches far back of the earliest records of the first king as Herodotus gives it, copying from the Egyptian priests.

We visit the region where poetry, and myth, and tradition have placed a most ancient civilization—Egypt, the Black Land, the Land of the Nile: we search its royal sepulchers, its manifold history written in funeral records, in kingly genealogies, in inscriptions and in the thousand relics preserved by domestic life, whether in picture, sculpture, or the embalmed remains of the dead, and we find ourselves thrown back to a date far beyond any received date of history.*

An answer to the evidences of the high antiquity thus given by the excavations in the valley of the Nile has been attempted on the supposition that bricks and bits of pottery might have fallen into the ancient wells which were common in that land, and a shaft might have been sunk in one of these. But this solution is not admissible; for seventy out of the ninety-five borings were away from the sites of towns and villages, and

* Races of the Old World.—Brace.

"pieces of burnt brick and pottery were extracted almost everywhere and from all depths, even sixty feet below the surface."

But admitting that these fragments of human art were obtained at the depths above indicated, the evidence thus furnished is too uncertain for any dogmatic assertion whatever of a vast antiquity, as will appear partly from the fact that no accurate, chronometric scale has yet been found to measure the annual or centurial deposits of Nile sediment. Egyptoölogists regard the conclusions as to average of the matter thrown down in a Nilotic inundation as vague, owing to the great variation at different places and times; to the possibility that an arm of the river might have once been where later the borings were made, and also to the fact that the Egyptians were accustomed to inclose the areas where the temples, statues, and obelisks stood with an embankment, which, if the water should break over, a deposit would be formed in a few days which it would take a century or more to form on the plain; and it is from the deposits near the base of these ancient monuments that the standards of comparative measure have been attempted to be made. A still greater uncertainty arises from the geological fact of subsidence and upheaval; that is to say, the successive changes of level may have been so great that no comparison can be made directly between the modern and ancient rates of the alluvial deposit. A standard of comparison has been attempted by determining the amount of Nile mud which had accumulated a few miles above the apex of the delta, and about the bases of certain ancient monuments, during the last three thousand years when these monuments are supposed to have been built. The centurial rate of increase in this Nilotic sediment is used as a scale for approximately measuring the time for the alluvial formations above the lowest of the ancient relics alluded to. Now the bulk of the area of the delta of the Nile is never reached by the river inundations, yet the whole of it has been formed of river mud, so that the delta of the Nile has been subject during the centuries to a slow upheaval, and with this gradual upheaval there has been a corresponding thinness of the river flood, and consequently thinness of silt-deposit; and since the data of comparison were taken near Cairo, where the deposit of each flood is as thin as a sheet of drawing paper, owing to the shallowness of the flood,

there is no comparison possible for the annual deposit of ancient times, when the floods were deeper and more stagnant. Or, again, there may have been a local, gradual, unrecorded subsidence of the land in the earliest historic times, and in this case the greater depth of the flood and the slower motion of the waters would have formed the accumulations rapidly; so that we have no good ground for drawing conclusions as to the time for the accumulations of the whole mass, seeing that the conditions of accumulation have in all probability been utterly unlike in ancient and in modern times.* And this claim to a high Antiquity of Man, made from the exhumation of Egyptian relics and works of art, must be held in abeyance, not only as clearly not proven, but as highly improbable, from a candid interpretation of the facts on which the archæological evidence rests.

REMAINS OF HUMAN ART AND OF EXTINCT RACES OF QUADRUPEDS IN THE VALLEY OF THE SOMME.

The valley of the Somme, in Picardy, France, has become famous by the discovery of a large number of flint implements, the works of barbaric human art, resting in beds of undisturbed clay, gravel, and sand, and coexisting with the remains of extinct species of animals which were supposed to have flourished untold centuries before the Age of Man. This juxtaposition in a geological drift is regarded as a coincidence of existence in time, and thus the human period is put backward into the post-tertiary and made to measure centuries where the common chronology gives years. These flint implements are rudely formed spear-heads, knives, and hatchets, and are found imbedded in an old river-bed in company with the remains of the extinct elephant, rhinoceros, the cave hyena, and lion, not now living, and other animals of existing species. "These rudely chipped lumps of chalk flint were fashioned to serve the functions of hatchets, knives, and other tools, and it is conjectured of instruments of war likewise. They occur in considerable numbers in the gravel quarries or sand pits of Abbeville and Amiens, and also at a few other spots bordering the rude valley of the Somme, more sparsely on the Seine, at Paris, and at one locality in England, namely, Hoxne, in

* British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1860.

Suffolk."* Those in North America, including the "Natches veteran, are not by American geologists considered sufficiently well authenticated to require notice."† This bed or drift consists of four strata: the lowest is a bed of fragmentary chalk flint, containing flint sand and flint tools, and occasionally blocks of hard Eocene sandstone; and with these are found the bones of gigantic mammalian quadrupeds, and the whole stratum rests on an uneven chalk floor that bears the evident marks of a violent erasive action of water. Above this is a stratum of grayish and brownish sand, with some species of fresh water and land shells, identical with species now existing in France and other places. This sand bears the marks of a quick deposition, the laminæ bending and waving to follow the eroded waving floor of the gravel on which they lie. There are but few of the worked flints or quadrupedal fossils in this stratum. Next above is another gravel, composed of chalk flints in a tossed, broken condition, and bearing the marks of turbulent waters, as of swift and eddying currents. The uppermost deposit is a stratum of brown clay, destitute of mammalian remains and of flint tools, but containing "regularly shapen stone coffins of unquestioned Roman origin, often containing a skeleton in a well conserved state."

Now from the evidences given by these gravel pits, as well as from other geological and antiquarian sources, it is claimed by Lyell and others that these chipped flints are tools of human origin and use; that the imbedded collocation of these tools and mammalian fossil remains proves that the makers of the tools and the possessors of the bones were cotemporaneous; that, consequently, an immense antiquity must be assigned the human race, far transcending the present brief chronology, in order to make man coeval with those extinct quadrupeds.

First, as to the natural or artificial agency in the shaping of these flints. To the testimony of their human manufacture there is scarcely a dissenting voice among scientific men. They

* Blackwood, Oct. 1860. This report in Blackwood was written by Professor H. D. Rogers, who visited the valley of the Somme and spent some time there examining the flint implements and the diluvium containing them, for the sole purpose of deciding upon their reputed traces of primeval man. It is to this article that we are much indebted for evidence against the positive claims made for a very remote antiquity of the race.

† Dana's Manual of Geology.

are of a few generic types, and the manner in which they are trimmed is peculiar, and betrays a design which no geological cause or the mechanical natural agencies could give. About 2,000 of these flint-tools have been found, and from the recurrence of the same shape and size of the several types, with the absence of recognizable transitional forms between them and the mere chalk flints, or rubble of the quarries, it is pretty generally assented to that their shaping is of artificial origin. The two prevailing forms are the spear-heads, varying in length from six to eight inches; and the oval shaped, much resembling the stone implements now used as hatchets and tomahawks by the native Australians. These flint-tools have a general bilateral symmetry, such as could only be produced by chipping flakes from the sides, which flaking makes the tool a tolerably efficient saw as well as knife. From the evidence given, it is concluded that these tools belonged to savage tribes that once inhabited Western Europe.

Secondly, as to the cotemporaneity of the users of these tools with the extinct mammals whose bones are found buried with them. The question then here is this: Were the makers or users of these flint-tools dwellers in the same land, and at the same time, with the extinct elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and other quadrupeds which geologists, since the time of Cuvier, have been agreed passed out of existence in Western Europe unnamable centuries ago, so that the same inundation, or whatever the destructive agency may have been that destroyed the one, destroyed the other also, and buried them in their first burial together? Or did the animals perish first, and then some after-flood wash up their remains, and re-entomb them with the later remains of human workmanship in the same diluvial grave? Geology has no positive, perfectly decisive answer to these queries either way. From their mixed collocation in the drift, either mode of deposit might have been the true one. But before adducing the testimony which the deposit itself gives as to the method of that drift formation, it is well to refer to the two extreme modes of geological changes in the earth's surface, namely, the secular or uniform, and the paroxysmal.

The secular movements are those slow, gradual changes of the surface which require centuries or long periods of time to

accomplish. The forces of nature, in their quiet, equable, slow modes of action, elevate or depress the land, erode the valleys, flex the rocky strata into mountain ranges, and accumulate beds of drift, only by the lapse of an immense duration. Such secular movements are even now in progress. In Sweden the extreme southern part is slowly sinking, the northern part rising. Since the Christian era parts of the Italian coast have suffered elevation and depression to an extent of twenty or thirty feet in each direction. If the deposits in the valley of the Somme are of the slow secular formation, then a high antiquity must be conceded to the flint implements buried so far beneath the surface. The paroxysmal changes, or those which suddenly, rapidly, violently take place, are often in close connection with earthquakes, sudden inundations, and express the quicker, more explosive, and violent energies of nature. The mutations of the surface in these cases are not slow and uniform, but rapid, brief, and irregular. The waters, in their paroxysmal action, are not a quiet inflow, but a surging, rapid, turbulent current, which forms in a few hours or years an accumulation of sediment that would be a myriad of years in forming under the slow secular mood. If the deposits in the valley of the Somme are referable to a turbulent paroxysmal action, then a brief antiquity only need be assigned it. Now the deposit inclosing the flints and bones has all the signs of a *turbulent diluvial action.*

The upper beds of the chalk formations on which they rest have been torn up and broken into a fragmentary mass or rubble, a mixture of rolled lumps of chalk and nodules of chalk flint. The surface of the chalk is uneven, with shallow troughs and basins hollowed in it as by a passing, erosive flood moving with a strong eddying current. The diluvial deposit itself consists of fine and coarse gravel and sand, rolled flints, subangular fragments of all sizes, not *sorted*, but promiscuously mixed, dipping and abutting at high angles among themselves, and inclining toward nearly all points of the compass—features, all of them, plainly implying a *violent* and *transient* surge. As if to offer a still more unequivocal proof of the energy of the transporting current, this wildly-tossed gravel contains scattered boulders of compact sandstone, and vary from one foot to three feet in diameter, and the largest weighing half a ton. The upper surface of the gravel is more undulating than the lower, and, what is of especial significance, the rude layers within the deposit follow imperfectly the undulations of the upper boundary. To all these marks of diluvial action must be added those presented by the fossil bones and teeth, and by the

flint implements, very few of which latter are destitute of traces of attrition with the gravel, while so many of them have been so much rubbed down as to retain but faintly the features of works of human art. The argument here is, that by pointing to an agency—an incursion of the by no means distant ocean—perfectly capable of invading the land within historic time, and mixing up its more recent surface objects with previously buried relics of an earlier or pre-historic date, we are debarred from assuming that the two classes of monuments were coeval, and that from the imputed age of the one, we can infer the antiquity of the other. It is far from our meaning here that we can disprove the cotemporaneousness of the flint-shaping men and the great antediluvian quadrupeds. We only assert—but assert confidently—that the phenomena utterly fail to *prove it*. If, therefore, it can be shown on an interpretation of the geology, in accordance with sound physical principles, that a re-dressing of the deposit may have taken place, the verdict must be that this coexistence in time is *not established*, and the high antediluvian antiquity of man must be cast out of the high court of science with a verdict, *Not proven*. —*Prof. H. D. Rogers.*

Thirdly, as to the great antiquity of these mammalian remains, and consequently of the human implements. Even if we admit the cotemporaneity of these, the very remote antiquity of the extinct quadrupeds does not follow; for, until recently, these animal remains were never found associated with human remains, these latter being found only in the more superficial deposits of recent times. And this fact of dissociation in different strata led geologists to assign a comparatively high antiquity to these last animals. But since in certain caves, and in beds of alluvium, their remains are found together, and this juxtaposition apparently indicates that man began to exist before the extinction of these post-tertiary races, which is the more natural inference, the greater recency of the old elephant or the greater antiquity of man? Is it not as rational to bring forward the age of the elephant as to push backward the age of man? Now, since some of the cotemporaries of these extinct mammals have become extinct in the historic period, it is not at all unwarrantable to suppose a period not very remote for their extinction. The aurochs (*bos bison*) of Europe, one of the cotemporaries of the old elephant, (*elephas primigenius*,) would have been exterminated long since but for the special protection of man. The *bos primigenius* of the post-tertiary, supposed to be the urus described by Cesar in his "Commentaries," is now quite extinct. Yet the

remains of these historic animals occur with the remains of man, and with the bones of the extinct post-tertiary, in such a way as not to warrant a different age being assigned to them. The diluvium of the geologists, being found full of the bones of gigantic animals no longer existing, and not a bone or tool of man being found there, was regarded as very ancient as compared with man; but now when these are found coexisting, the natural assumption is that of the relative recency of the extinct animals, and not the great age of living man. The whole case, then, on the supposition that the earliest men and the latest of the animals were coeval, briefly stated, and as in accordance with the facts of geology and zoology, is this: The post-tertiary period, subdivided into the Glacial, Champlain, and Terrace epochs, was the one in which these huge land animals lived, and their meridian was probably reached in the Champlain epoch; but the Terrace epoch, which introduces the age of man, saw their decline; and likewise in this Terrace epoch, which was the transitional stage between the post-tertiary and the age of man, we may suppose that the vanishing life of these animals lapped over on to the initial period of human life. As the evidences are now summed up, the verdict for the immense antiquity of man, and the extreme remoteness of the time of the extinction of European mammals, is *not proven*.

CAVE EVIDENCE.

Other evidences relied upon as favoring a remote existence of man upon the earth, are those derived from the caverns in which parts of human skeletons and human relics, such as pottery, flint arrow-heads, and knives have been found with the bones of ancient mammals before referred to, and sometimes found in such *relative positions and conditions* as to preclude (it is averred) any other supposition than that these were their first and unchanged entombments. These caverns exist in various places in the British Isles, France, Sicily, and South America. The argument here is twofold, as in the cases mentioned before: first, the implements of art and the fossil remains of man being mingled in one common tomb with the fossil remains of races of animals not now living, these animals and man must have been coeval; secondly and consequently, the animals belong to a remote antiquity, and man shares their

age, and the date of his introduction on the earth is thus put back, at the shortest, many centuries prior to the records of the Mosaic chronology. But mere juxtaposition is no safe criterion of cotemporaneity. Sometimes the human bones and implements are confusedly mingled with animal remains, sometimes above and sometimes below them. These animals were the cave bear, hyena, elephant, rhinoceros, and existing species of beaver, boar, etc. The late Dr. Schmerling of Liége, a "skillful anatomist and paleontologist," has given us a description of over forty of those bone caverns, in which the bones of men were so rolled and scattered as to forbid the idea of their having been intentionally buried there, and his inference was that the caverns of Liége had received their organic contents, mixed with mud and sand and stones, and also land-shells, by floods whose streams had swept these into them from the surrounding country, there being chasms or fissures connecting the caves with the surface of the land. In the contents of such caves there is no evidence of cotemporaneousness of life. Most of the caves bear evidence of inundations, and seem to have served in some cases, as in Franconia, as the channels of subterranean rivers, and thus the remains of animals belonging to very different periods would be brought into a common tomb. And further, if man and these carnivorous animals had lived together in the same land, and found a common tomb, we should expect the bones of man to exhibit the marks of being gnawed or broken, but the indubitable marks of gnawing are not to be seen. And if they lie side by side, we may suppose, and the supposition is within the warranty of geologic changes, that the cave was the hiding and burial place of the beast, and a flow of waters brought in the sand and mud for its gradual burial. Ages after it might have become the habitat of man and his burial-place, and then some subsequent flood rushing through the cavern would mingle their bones to a common level, or reverse their relative position. The high position of some of these caves above the level of rivers is readily accounted for by the upward movement of land which many localities are even now undergoing; and if this upward movement was rapid, fissures might be opened into which fossil remains of different ages might easily become mingled. And when we consider that these caves were in the earlier ages used as places of habi-

tation, burial, concealment, and defense, it is easy to conceive the mingling of human with brute fossils. And still further, upon what ground must we admit the great antiquity of these animals not now living? If the *elephas primigenius* did not live in Gaul when Cesar conquered it, might it not have been a tenant there 2,000 years or more before, when, according to ethnographic and linguistic evidence, a great tide-wave of emigration preceded the Celtic one over Western Europe? Says Prof. Owen: "They had evidence, from the writings of Julius Cesar, of the existence in England 2000 years ago of two gigantic species of ox and one of reindeer, and he himself was satisfied that they once had a native British lion, all of which are now extinct in this country, and he saw nothing in the remains which had been discovered at Brixham (on which considerable stress is laid by the high antiquity advocates) to lead him to suppose that these animals lived before the historic period."* Examine the evidences where we may, and a natural, unstrained method of interpretation will yet allow the old chronology of the race to rest. The summing up of the evidence claimed in favor of an antiquity of man which places his existence on the earth long prior to the received dates is, that the claim is not sustained.

THE PRE-ADAMITE MAN.

But if the mammoth, the great cave bear, and the gigantic quadrupeds which have never lived within the historic memory of man, did have their meridian and extinction long prior to the received dates of man's origin; and if the men of the flint age—those makers of the clumsy flint tools—were coeval with them, living fifty or a hundred thousand years ago, or it may be living before geologic agencies had given the present features of land and sea, and when both man and mammoth may have walked on dry land from England to France, or Spain, what then? The Darwinian geologists are ready with an answer both as to fact and theory. They hold not only the doctrine of progression, or the gradual and continuous evolution from a lower up toward a higher type of being, but they hold its twin doctrine of transmutation, or the passage from one type of being to another, through the transitional processes

* British Association, Leeds, 1858.

of variation and selection. Man thus, by a continuous series of developments, has been derived in an unbroken line of descent from the lower animals. And, accordingly, to go no further back in the series, the ape family are his ancestors, and between them and him were a race of low-browed, small-brained savages of which the fossil man found in the cave of Neanderthal is an illustrative type. It is true that this Neanderthal skull is too isolated and exceptional, and its age too uncertain, to give any secure ground by which to firmly establish the theory by fact. Nevertheless, the theory is held to be consistent, that the further back we can trace man, the line of that backward descent will be a continual convergence toward, and a final coincidence with apish, anthropoid quadrumana, and therefore the Neanderthal skull is typal of the inferior races which serve as links between Chimpanzee and man. But that skull, so low and narrow in the forehead, and with so vile a slope in the facial angle, we doubt not can find its congeners in the Cornwall mines or London city. And the knowledge of this fact, and the absence of other like fossil skulls, and the presence of fair Caucasian-shaped ones, [as the Engis and other crania found in a like situation, and apparently of an equal antiquity,] and also the almost utter absence of reliably supporting evidence for their theory, have induced the transmutationists generally to use the Neanderthal man simply as an illustrative, not an actual type, of that progressive development which evolves the philosopher from the frog. The sum of the whole matter is this: Science affords no reliable evidence of a physiological transition from apes to man, the Natches and the Neanderthal men of "perhaps 100,000 years" notwithstanding.

There is another supposition in regard to Pre-Adamite man that requires a brief statement only; for it is only a hypothesis having a strong dash of imaginative daring, deriving its support from certain analogical hints in the typal progressions of animal and vegetable life, and framed to meet some supposable, future definite collision between the accepted conclusions of science and the interpretations of the first chapters of Genesis. It is this: Man is not "one of the primates alongside of the monkeys; he stands alone, the Archon of mammals," the sole species of the genus homo, and as such the Scriptures give us his genealogy, and all that they affirm refers to

the existing race only. They are utterly silent as to the inferior human races which lived on the planet before the Adamic one. This race, or these races, were swept from the earth before Adam appeared, and became the head of the present family—the successor, but not the offspring, of lower, more primordial races—and to him alone belong the words of Scripture; while to those barbarians, the users of flint knives, and hunters of mammoth and auroch, and collectors of Danish refuse heaps, and owners of ape-like skulls, death-sleepers in caves and in drift with extinct rhinoceros and bear and reindeer, belong the words of that antiquarian geology which adopts the theory of the high antiquity of man. But when the proofs of this theory are given, it will then be time enough to examine its claims. It is at present a "philosophic vision," and as a scientific question there are not data enough for a dogmatic decision.

Art. IV.—THE EMOTIONAL ELEMENT IN HEBREW TRANSLATION.

[FOURTH ARTICLE.]

ISAIAH XXI AND JOB IV.

Among the Hebrew modes of emotional expression, the most difficult of translation, though the most effective when felt and understood, are those that arise from what may be called the Shemitic conception of time, as reckoned, not from an absolute present, but from an assumed shifting present, suggested by the interest of the narration or the emotion of the narrator. As it appears in the Old Testament, it is of two species, which may be described as the *abrupt infinitive*, having, seemingly, no regard to time at all, and the *subjective future*, which ever presents a futurity in fact, or an expectancy in feeling, to the standpoint assumed by the speaker.

The first presents what may be called a *standing*, the second a *moving* picture. Both give us the appearance of soliloquizing language, whether of strong emotion, in which case it will be abrupt and startling, or of musing meditation,

when it will present more appearance of method, but still without those connectives which make the logical, the didactic, or the calmly historical style.

Examples of the abrupt infinitive are found, to some extent, in the coldest languages; but sometimes we cannot help regarding them as affectations of speech, designed to imitate spirit and emotion rather than as true and hearty expressions of them. They abound in Sallust, where we have frequently such sentences as these: Igitur reges populique finitimi bello *tentare;* at Romani domi militiaeque intente *festinare*, *parare*, alius alium *hortari*, hostibus obviam *ire*, libertatem, patriam, parentes, armis *tegere*. Such a mode was, doubtless, thought to give an air of animation, or a feeling of vigor; but when emotion is really wanting in the writer, as we feel to be the case with this artificial historian—so different, in all respects, from the Hebrew prophets—we come to regard it as rhetorical rather than eloquent.

In Homer they are introduced less frequently, but always with a fine effect, because there is ever something in the preceding or succeeding facts that operates like the preparation and resolution of the grammatical dissonance. Take, as a very plain, yet significant example, (Iliad, xvii, 691,) where Menelaus, in the alarm and hurry of the battle-field, says to Antilochus—

> ἀλλὰ σὺ νῦ' αἶψ' Ἀχιλῆϊ θεῶν ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
> εἰπεῖν κ. τ. λ.

Literally, "But you, running to tell Achilles quickly, that he may soonest place the naked corpse in safety by the ships." It is the mode, in grammars and scholia, to explain this as "the infinitive used for the imperative." Such a canon may do, indeed, as a mere mnemonic rule of short-hand parsing; but it fails utterly in this, that it does not point out what there is in the sentence that makes a demand for this seeming irregularity. Again, it is explained as a case of "ellipsis of the governing word." But still the question remains, What is gained in clearness, emphasis, or power, that this abrupt style of speech should be resorted to in certain cases? The poet never thought of any such explanation. It may be doubted whether Homer would have understood the scholiast or grammarian who should have thus reduced to rule his impetuous, irregular, and impassioned movement. Why is the governing word left

out? The answer is, that an *unusual* emphasis intended for a certain word, or a certain idea, must lead to some anomaly in construction, if the writer would avoid the weakening effect of attempting the same thing by means of epithets and paraphrases. It is the mode that nature and feeling prompt for drawing attention to it, thus isolating it, as it were, from the more common modes of expression that may precede or follow it. In doing this, the same number of words is to be preserved; for conciseness is essential to energy. Emotion will not bear any thing that looks formal or studied. A logical structure immediately makes *thought* predominant at the expense of *feeling*, and this, in the supposed cases, is not what we want. To effect that prominence of certain words which is demanded for the pictorial effect, there is required an *anomalous*, that is, an *uneven*, or broken sentence. This is to be transferred, in the best way we can, to another language, and that is the best translation which, with the least sacrifice of *thought*, preserves the most of that irregular literality on which the *feeling* depends.

Take, for example, the passage already quoted from Homer, (Iliad, xvii, 691.) Here, besides the command, there is to be given to the agent, personally, a peculiar prominence. Σὺ . . . τλῶν—"*you* to tell." It is yours, Antilochus, above all other men, to tell Achilles the sad fact of his comrade's death. Here is not only command, but the *reason* for it; here is the emotional energy with which it is given, all preserved in the startling form of the sentence; as though the din of the conflict, so fiercely waged over the slain warrior, would not allow time for connectives, or the regularity of thought necessary for formal governing words.

This abrupt infinitive may express a still more peculiar and emotional emphasis than is required in examples like the one quoted from Homer. And so we often find it in Hebrew, which, in boldness of phraseology, goes beyond almost every other language. Take, for example, Job xl, i: "And the Lord answered Job and said," הֲרַב עִם שַׁדִּי יִסּוֹר,* which is so tamely as well as erroneously rendered in our translation, "Shall he that contendeth with the Almighty instruct him?"

* הֲרַב. It is the infinitive Kal, as in Judges xi, 25—הָרֹב רַב עִם יִשְׂרָאֵל "What! fight—fight with Israel!" The ה, in both cases, is the particle of sur-

This is not the style. It is not a question; it is not an assertion, nor a command, but a pure exclamation, that bursts from the storm-cloud, after this long enumeration of the great works of God. It is an expression of indignant astonishment at the murmuring human audacity. "To contend with the Almighty!" It is this simple, startling infinitive;* and any change or addition only obscures the meaning, and weakens the force of the reproof. "Contend with the Almighty! O complainer!" "He that reproveth God, let him answer it." And then, in perfect keeping with this sharp challenge, comes the response of Job: "Lo, I am vile; what *shall* I answer thee. I put my hand upon my mouth. Once have I spoken, but I will not reply; twice—but I will answer no more." I will contend no more.

One great use of these abrupt infinitives, where a number occur together, is to denote vivid contrasts, to which attention is drawn by the appearance of such broken words placed in unusual forms. We venture to think that we have here the true key to the right interpretation of that difficult passage, Isaiah xxi, 5, so incoherent, as it stands in our Bibles, and apparently so unmeaning. It is a series of these broken infinitives, without any governing word, and with hardly anything that can be called syntax belonging to them. The speaker seems unconscious of everything else but a strange scene of mingled opposites that rises before his prophetic vision. Under the awe and excitement produced by it, he is talking to himself. Now,

prise. Our translators have taken יִסּוֹר as a verb, but it is a noun in the vocative, formed like גִּבּוֹר, Gen. x, 9; Isa. ix, 5. It is an indignant address—O complainer! O reprover!

* Conant, in his very excellent translation of the book of Job, renders it: "Will the reprover contend with the Almighty?" So Umbreit, "Will nun mit dem All Mächtigen der Tadler rechten?" Ewald, still better: "Will hadern mit dem Höchsten er der Tadler?" "Will he quarrel with the Highest? the fault-finder!" The difference between Ewald and Umbreit shows how much more of point and force may be given to a sentence by a very slight change in the words, or even in their collocation. All of these translators, however, unnecessarily change from the literal infinitive form, and so make it a question instead of an exclamation.

Gesenius remarks, that the infinitive thus in connection with its subject noun is rare, and besides this place, he cites Ezek. i, 14. But, if our view be correct, it is the vocative, instead of the direct subject, and this changes the whole aspect of the case. In Ezek. i, 14, הַחַיּוֹת רָצוֹא וְשׁוֹב, the noun may be taken as the nominative independent, and the infinitives treated as substantives: "And as for the living creatures, their *running* and *returning* was as the appearance of lightning."

the soliloquizing style, though solemn and earnest, is generally calm and meditative. Here, however, it is passionate and abrupt. It indicates astonishment and alarm. The seer seems like one in terror at his own ideals. He calls out in perturbation, as though the scene were actually before him, and his voice could reach the unconscious participants. One after another, in quick succession, arise the vivid pictures, and each one brings out from him its cry of astonishment, mingled with warning to the actors: ערך השלחן צפה הצפית אכול שתה קומו השרים ומשחו מגן. This is rendered in our version by a series of undistinguished, uncontrasted imperatives: "Prepare the table; watch the watch; eat, drink; arise, ye princes, and anoint the shield." Now, they are not imperatives, but exclamations, properly expressed, and to be rendered as infinitives. Instead, too, of this apparent unconnected rhapsody, the preparing the table, the appointment of the watch, the eating and drinking, the rising and anointing the shield, must be in some kind of contrast, and can only make sense by being so regarded. This, however, is inconsistent with their being all parts of one command, or one series of commands. Besides, there would be no reason in a change from the infinitive form (as given by the Masoretic pointing) to the direct imperative (and that, too, plural number) in the last two. Now let the reader take them just as they are, only supplying that punctuation which is necessary to mark the contrasts that are in the things themselves, and must, therefore, be supposed to have been in the mind of the speaker. "To set the table! to appoint the watch; to eat! to drink! arise, ye princes, and anoint the shield." The first two are in direct contrast. The one is the preparation for the banquet, as it passes before the prophetic vision; the other, the prophet's own exclamation, in view of what would be far more suitable for such a time of foreseen danger. So of the third and fourth taken together as followed by the direct imperatives in the fifth and sixth. It is the language of one crying out to himself, as he stands upon his watch-tower and sees the vivid panorama passing before him. He verbally paints the scene, and mingles his own ejaculations with it. The reader must put himself in his place, and then he will feel the emotion that is roused by these broken infinitives, just as it is presented in the Hebrew. He wants no gov-

erning word, no logical connectives, no grammatical fulcra of any kind, for these would only weaken the feeling, while really adding nothing to the thought. In a sentence of low animation such logical helps might be in demand; but here the emotion holds up the thought, and makes it clear in the light of its own vividness.

A fuller explanation, however, of such a sentence requires that we should go further back into a survey of the whole chapter. As the passage is one of curious interest, on many accounts, we hope our readers will have patience with such a running commentary. The opening, משא מדבר ים, rendered "the burthen of the desert of the sea," (*onus deserti maris*,) has been variously explained. The prophecy, beyond all doubt, relates to Babylon, and, therefore, it has been supposed that מדבר ים must be a name of Babylon itself. The opinion is as old as Hieronymus, who refers to Jeremiah li, 36, where God says of Babylon, "I will dry up her sea," a kind of language supposed to be used because they vauntingly called the Euphrates their sea, even as the Egyptians called the Nile their sea, and the Arabians still style it *El bahar*. Rosenmüller and Lowth maintain the same view, and to them the reader is referred for the chief authorities and arguments in its support. We cannot, however, agree with it. Although it is thus said, "I will dry up *their sea*," in reference to their own boast, yet nowhere in the Bible is Babylon itself, or the land of Babylonia, called "the sea," much less "the desert of the sea," which seems to have in it no propriety at all as a name of that splendid city and empire. All difficulty, however, is avoided, while a wonderful pictorial vividness is given to the prophecy, if we regard מדבר ים, "the desert of the sea," as the name of the *direction* in which the vision comes, rather than that of its locality. A glance at the map here will show this better than any argument. Between Jerusalem and Babylon there was then, as there is now, an immense untraversed desert, lying east of the dead *sea* and the mountains of Moab. Hence it may, with the strictest propriety, be called the desert of the sea (the Dead Sea) in distinction from the lesser and better known desert which lay south of Judea. Across this terrible waste does the prophet, in his trance, behold the vision coming. The common traveled course from Babylon to Judea was a circuitous one,

necessarily made to avoid this desert. It was to the North, by the way of the Euphrates, and Syria, and Riblah, and "the entering in of Hamath." This was the track of the Assyrian and Babylonian armies, and this is the path the vision follows, Isaiah x, 27–33, entitled "the Burthen of Assyria." See how it is there given, in the same rapt, dreamy, trance-like style that is so characteristic of this burthen of the desert of the sea. There is the same soliloquizing, exclamatory language, as the invading host is seen marching on from station to station. "He is come to Aiath; he is passed on to Migron; at Michmash he hath laid up his carriages; they have passed the ford; they stop the night* at Geba; Ramah is trembling; Gibeah of Saul has fled; ring out thy voice O daughter of Gallim; hark to Laish, O poor Anathoth; Madmenah is gone; the people of Gebim gather themselves to flee; as yet to-day he remains at Nob; he is shaking his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem."

There is no mistaking this style. The sights are really seen; the sounds are really heard; subjective they may be, but not imagined, not a mere poetical painting. The exclamations mingled with them are real utterances of real emotion in view of things passing before the inward sense. "Hark† to Laish, O poor Anathoth!" It is all fact; it is all as distinctly seen as the "hills of Jerusalem, against which the rapidly nearing host seem already shaking the hand."

In this foreshadowing of Belshazzar's feast there is a similar clairvoyance or *clear-seeing*, a similar telegraphic vision of the distant in space widening its perspective angle, and the far off in time coming up the intervening centuries. It is more sudden, more startling, and presents itself to the prophet's soul from a different direction. There it was from the North, in the usual track of the Assyrian armies. Here, under the stronger afflatus, it may be supposed, or the more vivid impression, it comes right across the wide untraveled waste, as though it

* There can be no doubt that לָלִין here is a verb from לוּן, and not the pronoun, as the Vulgate renders it: *Gaba sedes nostra.*

† הַקְשִׁיבִי לַיְשָׁה. The ה in לַיְשָׁה, Isaiah x, 30, is the particle of direction, having, in this case, a remarkable graphic power: "Hark toward Laish." Our translation is wholly wrong in making the Hiphil here causative instead of intensive. Vitringa has it better: *Attende Laisam versus, O misera Anathoth!* Lowth wholly loses the imagery.

could not wait for the circumambient route; and so the prophet cries out in his ecstacy, Massa midh-bar yām, "the burthen of the desert of the sea! like whirlwinds in the South, with a burst,* it comes—from the wilderness, from the fearful land." Compare Deut. i, 19, מדבר הגדול והנורא, "that great and fearful wilderness." Here was one still more terrible, untraversed then, as it is untraversed† now, but known to lie in the direct line between Jerusalem and Babylon.

These considerations add greatly to the impressive mystery of the vision. It is in most graphic keeping with the perturbation and alarm with which the mind of the seer is suddenly affected, as the successive sights come sweeping across the desert toward which his prophetic gaze is directed. "A grievous vision, it is revealed to me," הֻגַּד לִי "placed right before my eyes." "The plunderer is plundering, the spoiler is spoiling, raptor raptat, vastator vastat—go up, O Elam, press the siege, O Media. For this my loins are full of anguish; pangs seize me like the pangs of a woman in travail; I revolt‡ from the hearing, I am dismayed at the seeing; my soul wanders, terrors affright me, my night of joy,§ it is turning for me into horror." The peculiar mental state of the prophet needs here to be carefully attended to. There are presented to him two opposite sights—the gathering war without, the security and feasting within. Each of them has, for the time, what may be styled a visual interest, called out simply by the emotion of the scene. He cannot help for a moment taking sides with the banqueters, so unconscious of the danger he sees coming upon them. Though they are deadly foes to his native land, yet in the immediate vision of their fatal security his quick identifying sympathy makes their joy and feast his own. Hence, at

* לחלוף. Here is again one of those abrupt infinitives which can only be truly given by something that will express the simple idea or action of the verb in its most startling form, separate from time and logical relation. It is best rendered adverbially—*at a burst, at a sweep.* The primary idea of חלף throughout the Shemitic languages is that of *transition*, or one thing coming suddenly in the place of another. Here it is the sudden burst again, after a lull or silence in the tempest.

† We have never read of its being traversed by any European explorer, or any Oriental caravan.

‡ נעויתי משמע, I am suddenly turned one side—*distorquor ut non audiam.*

§ Literally, it is "the evening of my joy," or my desire, נשף חשקי. It is the interest of contemplation rather than love that is here expressed by חשק—*nox desiderii mei, nox deliciarum mearum.*

the thought how soon it is to be interrupted, he cries out, "*My* night of joy is turning into horror." Alas, this scene that so stirs my soul with its light and beauty, so soon to be turned into waste and darkness! He cannot refrain from crying out, as though his voice could reach the revelers, and so he mingles his own ejaculations with the vivid pictures he is reading off. He expostulates with them, and in doing this is ever alternating between the emotion of the inner and the outer spectacle: "To set the table! (better) to set the watch; to eat! to drink! (Ah, no—to arms!) arise ye princes and anoint the shield." Some of the commentators are much occupied with the question to whom these last words are to be ascribed, whether to the Babylonians, aroused to their defense within, or to the hosts without. We think the view we have taken must commend itself to the reader who contemplates the whole style of the vision. It is the prophet's voice mingling with the scene of war and reveling. It is the voice of nature discarding all enmities at the sight of imminent danger threatening the secure. So the phrase "anoint the shield" has been variously interpreted, but it evidently means a process of preparation, either by way of polishing, or to make the shield more effective in glancing off the weapons of the enemy. (Compare 2 Sam. i, 21.)

This view of the passage is also in fine poetical harmony with the vision of the watchman that immediately follows: "For thus said the Lord unto me, Go set a watch—let him tell what he seeth. And he saw a riding, a brace of mounted men, one riding on an ass, and the other upon a camel; for he had listened—listened—long had he listened. And then he cried with a lion cry, Upon my watchtower, my Lord, I stand continually by day, and on the watch am I stationed all the nights, and lo! here it comes at last, a mounted man, a brace of mounted men, and one of them answers and says, fallen, fallen is Babylon, and the graven images of her gods hath one broken to the earth." There is the double subjective here—the prophet's vivid trance, and, as seen through it, the clairvoyant state of the watchman on the tower. In such a representation there is just that apparent mingling and introversion of thought that we should expect. The listening is told by the prophet out of its place, which comes in in reality, and, as it would appear in the language of the watchman, after what he says of

standing day and night upon the watchtower, and just before the הנה בא, "Lo! here it comes." The remarkable intensity of the Hebrew הקשיב קשב רב קשב, *hikshib kesheb rab kesheb*, (literally, "he listened a listening, how great a listening!") can only be smoothly given by similar, though not identical, repetitions in English. The eye is gazing far off into the depths of the desert, the ear is intently watching for every sound; then comes the vision of the courier, the announcement of the fall, the lion cry of the watchman, and immediately the prophet makes his report: "O my threshing, and the son of my threshing-floor," O people of my care, "what I have learned from Jehovah of Hosts, that have I revealed to you."

We are tempted to dwell still longer on this remarkable chapter. "The Burthen of the Desert of the Sea," is immediately followed by "The Burthen of Dumah." The position of this place,* too, far off on the last inhabited frontiers of this same desert region, in a direct line almost between Jerusalem and Babylon, confirms the view that we have taken. This is especially so, if we may suppose the two prophecies to be connected, either as parts of one prophetic ecstasis, as Vitringa supposes, and therefore placed in such immediate contiguity, or as actually referring to the same object.

There is no evidence that Dumah itself is the object of the prophecy. It has too little historical importance to warrant any such supposition, especially as nothing further is said about it, and no doom pronounced against it. Hence some have supposed that, for some reason, there is a change of name, and that Edom or Idumea is intended; but this is wholly gratuitous. Dumah and Edom (called by later geographers Idumea) may have some resemblance in sound, but every Hebrew scholar knows that they are radically different, with radically different significances in their roots. One is from אדם, an appellation of Esau, meaning *red*, (see Gen. xxv, 25;) the other from דום, meaning "to be silent," and so called, perhaps, from its position in the far off solitary waste. The opinion that Edom was intended may seem to have a feeble support in the mention of Seir; but this is only the place of the voice directed

* It is doubtless the same Dumah that is mentioned in Gen. xxv, 14, and 1 Chron. i, 30, and which is called by the Arabians Dumeth-el-Jendel, or "the Stony Dumah." It was east of the Dead Sea, and on the line between the Syrian Arabia and Arabia proper.

toward Dumah, the remoter station; and it therefore remains that this latter has either no significance in the prophecy at all, or, like מדבר ים, "the desert of the sea," it gives name to the vision, not as the object, but as the direction whence it comes. Thus viewed, there is no difficulty in regarding this "Burthen of Dumah," too, as referring to Babylon, and as, in fact, a solemn appendix to the former scene of tumultuous joy and closing horror. It is the fearful afterpart, in which an impressive silence seems to form the chief feature of the representation; so that although Dumah unquestionably denotes a locality in the vision, there is some reason for the idea of Vitringa that it has a scenic significance as connected with the radical sense* of דומה—noctis silentium gaudio lætitiæ, et luci oppositum—quum cessaverint strepitus diei—allusio allegorica ad argumentum prophetiæ de nocte agentis gravissimæ calamitatis. Let us attend carefully to the whole coloring of the language, and the picture rises before the mind, shadowy indeed, yet perfectly distinguishable in its somber outlines. The fall of Babylon has alarmed the nations. Inquiry is anxiously made respecting the doomed and desolate city. A voice in the darkness calleth out of Seir: "Watchman! what of the night? Watchman! what of the night?" The answer is returned from Dumah, it is sent back from the far off silence of the desert: "The morning cometh; cometh also the night." The first part of this mysterious response has been usually interpreted of triumph to the divine people, and the latter as denoting darkness to its foes; but both together may rather be taken as one indefinite expression of duration—"the *evening and the morning*," that, in Scripture language, make up the mystic day.† They come and go, these rounding times. Thus night shall follow morn, and morning night. Age after age, nature and history move on their steady course; the nations rise and fall, but there is no morn to Babylon; "the wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, the bird of darkness shall cry in her deso-

* For the impressive significance of דומה, see Psalm xciv, 17, where it is used for Orcus or Hades: "Had not the Lord been my help, I had well nigh dwelt in Dumah," the land of silence whence no answer comes, no traveler returns; also Psalm cxv, 17, ירדי דומה, "They that go down to Dumah"—like ירדי שאול, Psalm lv, 16, "They that go down to Sheol."

† See Dan. viii, 26, מראה הערב והבקר, "the vision of the evening and the morning," and compare with Dan. viii, 14.

late houses." "If ye will inquire, inquire* ye—return—come." According to the Hebrew idiom, שׁוּב has here an adverbial sense qualifying the other verb—שׁוּב אחר, "come *again*." It carries, moreover, the idea of reiteration. Not once but often ask concerning her fate; "come again and again;" the answer will be still the same. The night still rests on Babylon. She may have her representative until the end of time in many a wicked power and wicked Church; but for her, prophecy gives no more response; for her, the oracle is closed forever.

This is interpreting by the imagination, it may be said; but without the imagination (it may be retorted) exercised as legitimately and as correctly as we can, it is impossible to interpret Isaiah; and a man who has no imagination—like some modern exegetes, rationalistic and evangelical—should never attempt it. Surely he who has no faith in the reality of the prophetic pre-vision is utterly disqualified. Without such faith, and without some degree of sympathy for this pictorial style, all his talk of grammatical canons, and governing words, and infinitives used for the imperative, is frigidissimum. The language of the prophet is, beyond all question, rapt, ecstatic, broken, soliloquizing. Now where this really is the prophetic style, the criticism that ignores it lacks the first ground of a true exegesis. We can only connect such broken utterances by having the imagination intensely interested in the pictures presented, and some degree of a "like precious faith" in their divine reality. Then may we have some measure of modest trust in the filling up of the prophetic imagery, at least so far as its outward truthfulness is concerned. There are, doubtless, dangers in such a method; but, on the other hand, nothing is more certain to lead to error than the attempt to reduce such a writer to logical bands. The more stringent such a course, the wider the probable departure from the real significance, especially in such glowing passages as these.

In the ghostly vision of Eliphaz, Job iv, 12–18, we have one of the most striking examples of what we have called the *moving picture*, made by the use of the subjective future

* אם תבעירון בערי. This is a word occurring seldom in the ordinary Hebrew, (see Obad. 6,) but quite common in this sense, in the Chaldaic or Syriac. There is, therefore, an admirable fitness in putting it in the mouth of one who thus responds for Babylon; and it is a very weak argument that would deduce from it a later date to the prophecy.

presenting a futurity in fact, or an expectancy in feeling, to the standpoint assumed by the speaker. Connected with this remarkable passage are many important questions respecting the most ancient Shemitic notions of the spirit-world. Here, however, we would chiefly regard it as a most exquisite specimen of what may be called graphic, or pictorial writing. In all languages some such effect is produced by the use of the present for the past, thus transferring it from the narrative to the descriptive style, presenting a *movement* instead of a dead fact,—a living, stirring image, instead of a motionless, impassive history. For this, however, there is, in Hebrew, a peculiar aid arising from what may be called the subjective nature of its tenses regarded as having their scale and flow of time, not from an absolute or *fixed* present, but from the imaginative standpoint of the speaker, taken as a moving present determined by its relations to events that precede or follow. Especially is this the case with what is called the *future*, and, by some, the *imperfect* or unfinished. It is the flowing tense. It may sometimes be described as the anticipatory tense, wholly subjective, denoting an event, or series of events, conceived, not only as future simply, but as coming *toward* us, out of the future. The speaker, carried back into the midst of the scene, falls under the power of its scenic emotion, and describes as still approaching what is actually past. Thus thrown into a past present, his times take their relations from it. They are affected by the emotion. The feeling of awe revived immediately demands the prospective, expectant, apprehensive language that belongs to it. We have all heard men tell a story, in this way, when under the power of strong emotion. In such circumstances, instead of saying, "I saw," the animated narrator or describer says, "I see*—I see it *coming;* now it *is* here; now it is there; now it *begins* to move," and so on, instead of using the past, it was, it began, etc. When the real past occurs in such a series, it is always by way of explanation, or comment on the passing events. Its force is felt in stopping the flow of imagination, or shifting the scenery, so as to introduce some omitted or cotemporaneous fact.

* It is a very common vulgarism to use *see* for saw—"I see it," meaning "I saw it." It has its reason, probably, in the stronger emotion of the sight-recollection, as compared with that of any other sense.

In the lifelike description of the vision of Eliphaz, the speaker is carried, not only in *medias res*, *into* the actual scene, but *back* of it, to a point just before it, where the awe of the spiritual and the supernatural would seem to be casting upon the soul the shadow of the coming events. It is the feeling of expectancy, of something coming, that thus colors the language, and brings the future form, as significant of this subjective state, into the very introduction, and that, too, without any direct "wau conversive," or any device of construction which the grammarians* might allege as a justification of the anomaly. It is "the future used for the past;" this is the wise explanation that some would give, as though nothing more were needed than this soulless canon. The translators, adopting some such rule, or regarding the form of the tense, in such cases, as something purely arbitrary, have actually rendered them in the past throughout, and thus destroyed all the pictorial effect. Had they rendered them as absolute futures, by our future forms *will* and *shall*, it would have been still worse, because, in that case, the English reader could not have helped referring them to the fixed present of the actual narrator. How, then, shall we do? In turning them into English we cannot well avoid something of paraphrase, but still the conciseness as well as the spirit of the passage may be, in some degree, preserved, by employing those terms that we resort to when we would express what may be called a past future, or an inceptive or relative future, in our own language, such as, "a-going to"—"a-going to be;" a common and plain style of language, indeed, but very vivid and very graphic when employed on occasions demanding it. It is like the inceptive future expressed in Greek and Latin, by such words as *μέλλω*, *fore*, *futurus sum*. Aside from these, certain particles, denoting, of themselves, expectancy, may answer the same purpose, or the translating verb itself may have in it, if happily chosen, so much of the idea of futurity, or of outlooking in the thought, as to answer the demands of this Hebrew future, irrespective of any particular tense forms, and without the aid of any paraphrastic particles.

* The most philosophical explanation of the Hebrew tenses may be found in vol. ii of Nordheimer's Hebrew Grammar. He comes the nearest to a principle that explains all their uses.

Let us try, then, and find the best mode of giving the spirit of this passage in English, avoiding, as much as possible, the strangeness of an impracticable brevity, as well as the weakness and tameness that come from the redundancy of paraphrase.

וְאֵלַי דָּבָר יָגֻנַּב. "A thing is stealing upon me," or, "comes stealing upon me." It is the language of awe and expectancy; the very language that suited the emotion at the time of the vision, and in which the soliloquizing spectator would have described it to himself. The transition to the subjective state immediately demands the future (the Hebrew future, we mean, with its peculiar idea of time) to correspond to it. "Something is coming; mine ear is about to catch a whisper thereof"—another future. It might be said that this second verb וַתִּקַּח is the common case of the future made past by the wau conversive, and that יגנב is an implied case of it as affected by the ו in ואלי. But even the wau conversive form, as used in dry historical narration, never wholly loses its future idea. Of itself, it denotes *succession*, the succeeding event future to the one with which the conjunction connects it, or to the starting event, from which the whole narration depends. They all take character from that first, and if that is not an absolute historical, but a moving point, then those which follow, until the succession is interrupted, are also moving.

"A thing comes stealing o'er me; mine ear is about to catch a whisper thereof." At this point the speaker seems to feel the need of some words to explain the emotion with which he so abruptly starts, and he comes back to the ordinary past times of narration. "It *was* amid anxious thoughts that *had* come from visions of the night, when deep sleep *had* fallen upon men." The time, therefore, is the simple past, followed by another which is the pluperfect or completed past to it. "Fear *had* come upon me, (קראני,) and trembling, which *made* all my bones to shake." And now begins the descriptive again, after this brief interruption of the narrative style, and the form of the Hebrew tense, true to the inward state of awe and foreboding which it represents, turns immediately to this future of expectancy: "For a spirit is going to pass," (יחלף.) He feels the premonition in his very flesh. "The hair *begins* to rise," (תסמר,) or, as it would be expressed by the Latin inceptive

verb, *inhorrescit.* "It is about to stand," (יעמד,) to assume form and position. I look,* "but I cannot discern the visage thereof. There is a dim outline before mine eyes. Silence! hark; it is a voice I hear. Shall a mortal be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" This solemn announcement at the close is that to which the whole picture is preparatory. It has all the more impressiveness from being preceded by this graphic language of awe and apprehension, and these Hebrew future forms are the well adapted means by which the emotional effect is produced. Even if some of them may be explained by the common grammatical rules, others must appear wholly arbitrary, unless interpreted as denoting the state of soul rather than the actual relation of the outward fact. On no other ground can we give a reason why קרא and התחיד, v, 14, should be preterites, while תסגר and יעמד, in the 15th, have the future form.†

Some few words demand a more particular attention than could be bestowed upon them without interrupting the general view.

מחזיונות would strictly mean "after the visions of the night, when deep sleep had fallen." It is to be inferred from this that it was in a waking state that had succeeded a disturbing dream. He is possessed with the feeling of a near spiritual presence. Whether the first emotion, as expressed verse 12,

* *I look.* These words simply express that outlooking, intently gazing state of soul which is implied in the words ולא אכיר. There is a similar implication in the words ואקול אשמע, just below: "Hark—a voice; let me hear it." The intent listening is implied in דממה, and hence it is followed by this subjective future. It might be said that אכיר is converted by the ו in ולא, but then it would be out of connection with the future יעמד, which is perfectly separate, and marks an independent time by itself.

† No writers show more critical acumen than some of the Rabbinical commentators, and yet none would think of charging them with excess of poetical imagination. It is, therefore, with much confidence we refer to Jarchi, in his comment on Job iii, 3, ואבד יום אולד בו, which may be compared with Jer. xx, 14. apparently the same thought, and similarly expressed, except that it has the verb in the preterite form, ולדתי בו, "Cursed be the day in which I *was* born." This is less forcible than the other, which has the future, and which Jarchi renders, "May the day perish in which I was *about to* be born, and when I was not yet born." The passage in Job is the most vivid and poetical. It requires a stronger act of the mind thus to place one's self before the event, and see it coming on. The contemplation of it as a fact in the past is less imaginative, and, therefore, less emotional.

was from a sight or a sound, or some indescribable sensation, it would not be easy to say. The ear, at all events, is listening, and now comes a deep impression of something like visible form. "A spirit is about to pass." It is an *expectation* that is shaping itself, and so we have not only a future, (יחלף,) but a very peculiar word, on which we have already briefly commented. Its primary idea is sudden transition, clear yet inexplicable, like the plant coming up out of the earth we know not how, Psa. xc, 6; or springing again from the withered trunk, Job xiv, 7; or the opposite process of passing away, Isaiah ii, 18; or the sudden change of the wind, Isaiah xxi, 1; or the quick change of thought, (אז חלף רוח,) Hab. i, 11; or the great scene shifting, when, as expressed by this same word, the worlds shall be renewed in the passing away of the old heavens and earth, Psa. cii, 27. This is the word used here, so admirably adapted to express the transition that is about to take place in the ghostly vision:

A change comes o'er the spirit of my dream.

"A form is about to pass before me," I have a presentiment, a foreboding sensation; "the hair of my flesh begins to rise."

Verse 16, מראה denotes something more distinct and visible than תמונה. The former is that which has feature and recognized expression, *aspectus*. The latter is mere appearance, (*species*,) outline, image, what Homer calls (Odyssey, iv, 835) *ἀδῶλον ἀμαυρὸν*, and though used for likeness* is etymologically less clear and distinct than מראה, which is here placed in contrast with it. See the distinction between these words very clearly traced in Maimonides, More Nevochim, sec. 3. The difference must be borne in mind to prevent a contradiction in the two clauses. And so we have rendered it in a way that comes nearest to the state of mind evidently set forth: "I could not distinguish the aspect, (the face and features,) and yet there is an outline, a dim shadowy appearance before mine eyes."

דממה. The first thought would be that this word, according to its plain etymological aspect, means *silence*, whether used as a noun or as an interjection. There is, however, some

*Thus Psa. xvii, 5, "*I shall be satisfied*" בהקיץ תמונתך "*when thy likeness awakes.*" The fainter term is used to heighten the intensity of the contrast: "I shall be satisfied when there awakes in my soul the first lineaments of the divine image, the first faint dawning of the resurrection likeness." So in Exod. xx, 4, where it means the faintest resemblance of anything in heaven or earth.

reason for regarding it as denoting a very low and scarcely perceptible sound, so called as the nearest audible thing to silence. Or it may mean an audible silence, a silence which makes itself felt, or of which we seem to have some sensation. There is some authority for this in the manner in which it is used, 1 Kings xix, 12, "After the fire and the earthquake," קול דממה דקה, "a still small voice," literally, "a voice of silence attenuated." The LXX have rendered it there, *φωνὴ αὔρας λεπτῆς*, and the Vulgate "sibulus auræ tenuis," "the soft whistling sound of the gentle breeze." So here, et vocem quasi auræ lenis audivi. In Psalm cvii, 29, it is the gentle whisper that remains in the lull of the storm, יקם סערה לדממה, when the tempest is falling; or, as the Vulgate expresses it, Statuit procellam ejus in auram, et siluerunt fluctus ejus. The Syriac translator has rendered it by the word ܙܡܪܐ, which means a musical instrument, like some low sweet-sounding flute, as though some soul-subduing strain of music was the prelude to the spirit's message. In this sense of a musical strain, it would be in admirable harmony with the spirit of the passage, 1 Kings xix, 12, "After the earthquake and the fire, a voice of modulation, low and sweet;" and so the Syriac has actually rendered it there, although not using the same word as in Job iv, 16.

After all the pains that have been taken, there are everywhere in the Hebrew Scriptures examples of the future form that cannot be solved by the usual grammatical rules.* We

* Even Nordheimer, the most philosophical of Hebrew grammarians, regards the Hebrew tenses as being occasionally employed in an arbitrary manner. "Sometimes" he tells us, (vol. ii, page 181.) "the absolute and relative futures are employed alternately in the same connection," and he gives, as an example, 2 Sam. xvii, 1, 2, 3, which is thus rendered into English: "I *will* choose now twelve thousand men, and *will* arise, and *will* pursue David, and *will* come upon him, and *will* make him afraid; and the people *shall* flee, and I *will* smite the king, and *will* bring back all the people unto thee." The English reader would have no idea that part of the verbs in the above have the preterite and part the future form. They all seem, too, to be "in the same connection," as far as one should carelessly judge from such translation. That is, they would seem to be a series of events all future, and not only that, but all "conceived as following" directly one after the other. A closer study, however, even of the English, would divide them into three classes, with an equal variety in their connections. The first four, the choosing, the arising, the pursuing, and the coming upon, are the purposes and intentions in the mind of the counseling Ahithophel, and therefore future. This would be intimated, too, by the paragogic ה, which makes them not only future

get along very well with the wau conversive of the future, and the seeming wau conversive of the preterite, as long as we confine our attention to the historical parts, though even in plain narrative the form thus employed denotes *succession* rather than *preterition* strictly, the absolute time being denoted by its relation to the starting point of the narrative. But in the poetry, and especially in the prophecy, we are all afloat, unless we adopt the principle, simple in itself, though not always easy to be applied, that the forms of the tense must be supposed to vary according as the inward emotion changes from the contemplation of a thing as done, to a state of hope or fear, that is, a state of expectancy, in relation to it.

An example or two will make this clear. Thus, Psalm cvii, 4, 5, is rendered, "They *wandered* in the wilderness, they *found* no city to dwell in; hungry and thirsty, their soul *fainted* within them." Here the verbs are all alike rendered in the past, but in the Hebrew the first and second are preterites, while the third has the future form. Why is this? There is no wau conversive here, nor any effect of particles analogous to it. But there it stands, תעו and מצאו in the first and second members, and תתעטף in the third. It cannot be arbitrary. There must be a reason for the change, and this is, we think, because the third denotes, not so much an outward fact, as a state of soul which must somehow be described. "They *wandered*, they *found* no rest;" and then the form of the tense suddenly changes; "they are just ready to faint,"

but optative, expressing *desire* as well as purpose and counsel: אקרמה . . . אחרה . . . ארדפה. "I *would* choose, I *would* arise, I *would* pursue," etc. On the other hand, the "making afraid, the putting to flight, the smiting," are the contemplated *accomplishment* of those purposes, the *facta*, or things done, and, therefore, relatively past. The last, the "bringing back the people," is the final *consequence* succeeding both purpose and accomplishment, and, therefore, absolutely future in itself, or relatively future in respect to the whole. Now this is exactly the way in which the Hebrew expresses it, (והחרדתי—ונס—והבאתי,) which may be thus turned into English by giving the conjunction its time, as well as its copulative force, and thus preserving the relations of the several parts: "I *would* choose now twelve thousand men, and I *would* arise and *would* pursue David, and *would* come upon him, and *when* I *had made* him afraid, and the people *had* fled, and I *had* smitten the king alone, then *would* I bring back all the people to thee." The ו in והחרדתי becomes the new pivot or hinge on which the time turns, and from which it is reckoned. This pivot we express, along with its conjunctive power, when we render it *when*. A similar examination would give a like result in other cases, and show that there is nothing arbitrary in language any more than in nature.

"they are on the point of fainting." The whole of this most graphic Psalm abounds in this. Let the reader cast his eye to the 26th verse, where we have futures all through. It is all vivid, out-looking emotion. Everything is described as it appears to the actors themselves who are *about* to realize it: "They are mounting up to the heavens; anon, they are *about* to descend into the deeps; their soul, in their distress, is just *ready* to melt." It is the language of one who is there in spirit, who sees the ship, now rising on the topmost surge, now sinking in the billows. He describes it with all the feeling of foreboding fear and expectant hope that would be natural in such a scene. Throughout the Psalm the preterite tenses, mingled with this animated painting, are but transition points; the life and emotion are in the futures.

Again, two events may be in the future, the far future, and yet one of them past as respects the other. This is expressed by the common case of the wau conversive of the preterite, which is said to make it future by connecting it with a future preceding. There is, however, in it something more than this. The converted past is not thus rendered a future *succeeding* a future, according to the mere order of the words, but rather preceding it, or, at least, simultaneous with it. Take, for example, Isaiah xxxv, 10, which is rendered: "They *shall* obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing *shall* flee away." The Hebrew has the second verb a preterite with wau, making it past to the first, though future in relation to the absolute prophetic stand-point. ששון ושמחה ישיגו ונסו יגון ואנחה: which may be literally rendered, "Joy and gladness they *will* overtake, sorrow and sighing *have* fled away;" or if we give the conjunction its true time-force, as well as copulative effect, "*when* sorrow and sighing *shall have* fled away." In our common translation, as in that of Lowth, no distinction is made, but there is, in fact, a striking and beautiful contrast. The prophetic vision takes its stand between the two events. One it sees as *coming on*, the other as already past and *receding*. "Joy and gladness *shall* they overtake, sorrow and sighing *have* fled away." How full of life and motion is this literal Hebrew. It is as though joy and gladness had been just before them during all their mourning pilgrimage; they have overtaken them at last; and

now sorrow and sighing have taken their final departure. They are

"With the years beyond the flood."

They are with the past forever.

This Hebraistic mode of expressing times is sometimes carried into the New Testament, especially that book of Revelations which comes the nearest in its style to the old prophetical Scriptures. We have an example of it, Rev. xxi, 4, which is closely allied to this thought in Isaiah xxxv, 10: "And there shall be no more sorrow, nor crying," πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, ὅτι τα πρῶτα ἀπηλθον, "there *shall* be no more pain, for the old things *have* passed away."

Art. V.—CONDITION AND CHARACTER OF NEGROES IN AFRICA.

The erroneous impressions which prevail in the civilized world respecting the condition of the Negro race in Africa are discreditable to the intelligence of the age. The people of the United States are doubly blamable for their false views on this subject, because we owe debts to that portion of our fellowmen for ages of wrongs inflicted on them for our benefit, and because, with ample means within our reach for correcting our erroneous opinions, we generally neglect them, and still persist in denying to negroes those intellectual faculties and moral qualities which the Creator has bestowed on the entire human family. With the books of recent travelers in Africa in their hands, it may well be wondered at that even our most intelligent and humane writers have not yet appealed to the testimony of Bowen, Livingstone, and Barth, to prove that millions of pagan negroes, in different parts of that continent, have been for ages in the practice of some of the most important arts of life, dwelling in comfort and generally at peace; while many other millions have been raised to a considerable degree of civilization by Mohammedism, and long existed in powerful independent states; under various changes, it is true, but

perhaps not so many or great as those through which the principal nations of "civilized Europe" passed during the same periods.

To refer to but one portion of the vast regions of Africa inhabited by the Black Race, namely, that extending along the southern border of the Great Desert, we find there, between the tenth and twentieth degrees of north latitude, five or six kingdoms, most of which have been in existence several centuries, and some a thousand years, mostly under the influence of Mohammedan institutions. These are everywhere similar, so far as they prevail, establishing fixed laws, customs, arts, and learning; and, although abounding in errors and evils on the one side, embracing benefits on the other which are not enjoyed by such portions of the negro race as remain in paganism. The Koran, as is well known, has copied from the Hebrew Scriptures many of the attributes of God and the doctrines of morality, with certain just views of the nature, capacities, duties, and destiny of man; and these are so faithfully taught, that they are conspicuous in the writings of many of the numerous authors in Mohammedan countries, and often displayed, in a more or less satisfactory degree, in the characters and lives of those educated in them.

Want of space in these pages must necessarily limit our remarks to very narrow bounds, and we shall therefore be unable to present many details which would interest the reader, and can give only a few facts relating to Mohammedan learning, its nature, institutions, and results. This forms an essential part of the Moslem system, and has long been in operation on large families of the negro race, and moulded them after the civilized model of the Arabs and Moors. Unlike Popery, it favors, nay, requires, as a fundamental principle, the free and universal reading and study of their sacred book; and, instead of withholding it from the people under penalties of death and perdition, it establishes schools for all classes, primarily to teach its languages and doctrines. Extracts from the Koran form the earliest reading lessons of children, and the commentaries and other works founded upon it furnish the principal subjects of the advanced studies.

As this has always been the practice, it may not seem strange that learning flourished among the Moors, in Spain, during the

Dark Ages of Europe, while Popery so long overshadowed the nations with her worse than Egyptian darkness. Readers who have neglected Africa may not be prepared to believe that schools of different grades have existed for centuries in various interior negro countries, and under the provisions of law, in which even the poor are educated at the public expense, and in which the deserving are carried on many years through long courses of regular instruction. Nor is this system always confined to the Arabic language, or to the works of Arabian writers. A number of native languages have been reduced to writing, books have been translated from the Arabic, and original works have been written in them. Schools also have been kept in which native languages are taught. Indeed, one of the most gratifying evidences has thus been furnished of the favorable influences exerted by the unrestricted use, as well as the general diffusion of the knowledge of letters; while the truth is not less certain, because hitherto unknown, that large portions of the African Continent lie open to the access of Christian influences through channels thus prepared by education.

These and other facts, which we shall not stop to mention, make it appear wonderful indeed that the African race should be judged by us only from that small and unfortunate portion of it found in the western continent. Where is the excuse for looking only at ten millions, more or less, of slaves and descendants of slaves in America, and entirely neglecting to inquire into the condition and character, the history and capacities of the hundred or more millions of negroes in their native country, who have had some opportunity to show what they are capable of? It is now time for public attention in the United States to be directed to Africa, and an attentive perusal of the most recent travels will afford the reader the details of many things which we can only cursorily mention in this article, while earlier publications will be found to afford confirmation of some of the most important facts. It certainly will bring more compunction to the hearts of the humane among us, to learn that the race which we have been accustomed to despise, as well as to ill treat, still lie under a load of evils perpetuated by the prejudices prevailing even among many of the most enlightened Christians; and it will be surprising to be told, that among the victims of the slave-trade among us have been

men of learning and pure and exalted characters, who have been treated like beasts of the field by those who claimed a purer religion.

About a hundred years ago a report reached England that a young African slave in Maryland, named Job-ben-Solomon, was able to write Arabic, and appeared to be well-educated and well-bred. Measures were taken to secure his release, and he was sent to England, where he assisted Sir Hans Sloane in translating Arabic, and acquired a character of the highest kind for intelligence, judgment, morality, and kindness of heart. He was sent up the Gambia River to Bundu, where he was received with the warmest welcome, and the truth of his story was fully proved, he being the son of the hereditary prince of that part of the country. Several other Africans have been known at different periods, in different parts of America, somewhat resembling Job-ben-Solomon in acquirements; but, unfortunately, no full account of any of them has ever been published. The writer has made many efforts to remedy this defect, and has obtained some information from a few individuals. But there are insuperable difficulties in the way in slave countries, arising from the jealousies of masters, and other causes, which quite discouraged a gentleman who made exertions in the South some years since, and compelled him to abandon the undertaking in despair, although he had resided in Africa, and had both the taste and the ability necessary to success. The writer has found a few native Africans in the North, of whom only three were able to write, and only one had opportunity to give him long personal interviews. "Prince," or "Abder-rahman," he saw once in New York, about the year 1830; from "Morro," or "Omar-ben-Sayeed," long living in Fayetteville, N. C., he procured a sketch of his life in Arabic; and from "Old Paul," or "Lahmen Kibby," he obtained a great amount of most interesting information. That venerable old man was liberated in 1835, after being about forty years a slave in South Carolina, Alabama, and other southern states, and spent about a year in New York, under the care of the Colonization Society, while waiting for a vessel to take him back to his native country. The writer held numerous and prolonged interviews with him, and found him deeply interested in making his communications concerning his native

country and people, as well as his own history, for the purpose of having them published, for the information of Americans. He often said, "There are good men in America, but all are very ignorant of Africa. Write down what I tell you exactly as I say it, and be careful to distinguish between what I have seen and what I have only heard other people speak of. They may have made some mistakes; but if you put down exactly what I say, by and by, when good men go to Africa, they will say, *Paul told the truth.*"

The writer has since arranged and written out the voluminous notes which he took from the lips of the old man, (some of them in stenography,) and has added many extracts from travelers and others, all confirmatory of his statements, but has never found an opportunity to publish them. It appears that his aged informant was in possession of many facts still unknown even to the most learned of America and Europe, which the most bold and enterprising travelers have failed to discover, though risking life, and even losing it, in the attempt. Three or four pages on the subject, published in 1836 in the proceedings of the American Lyceum, attracted attention in Europe, and the Paris Geographical Society to make repeated applications for more information; and Dr. Latham quoted them as one of the only three authorities on the Sereculy language, in his learned paper presented to the British Scientific Association. Dr. Coëlle, missionary of the Church Missionary Society, has since given a brief vocabulary of that language, (Paul's native tongue,) but without any particular information of the people. They are one of the negro families before alluded to, which are intermingled, without being amalgamated, over extensive regions in Nigritia, partly Mohammedan and partly Pagan.

His native country is Footah, peopled by several races, all governed by the Foolahs. This is the most western of the seven or eight separate and independent states or kingdoms lying in a remarkably regular series, and in a straight line along the southern boundary of the Great Desert, or Zahara, from Senegambia to Nubia and Abyssinia. These have been recently visited by that learned and energetic traveler, Dr. Barth, whose three octavo volumes contain a vast amount of information concerning those fertile and populous regions, their history and condition, so materially affected by the influence

of Mohammedism, which has prevailed in some of them for a thousand years. Why is it that ignorance of those countries still prevails among us? Why is the kingdom of Footah still so unknown, though only about three hundred miles distant from the Atlantic coast, and since the English and French have had trading posts on the Gambia and the Senegal for two hundred years? Because, as the Rev. Mr. Poole mentions in a late work, foreigners are still afraid to leave the rivers' side, having a dread of the wild beasts and savage men who are supposed to threaten death to every intruder who may venture to pass through the forests and swamps, which were long ravaged by slave-hunters, who sent their human victims to America. The Gambia and Senegal rise in the high grounds in the southern parts of Footah, and flow through much of its territory northward, and then turn west, to make their way through the low and hot district just mentioned to the coast. Only their lower waters are navigable, and only Park, Caillée, the Landers, and a few other travelers, have even gone beyond the heads of navigation when in search of Timbuctoo or the Niger; and the Rev. William Fox, the English Wesleyan missionary, who endeavored to establish a mission in Bundu about eighteen years ago. None of all these ever saw anything of Footah except the extreme northern portion; and all were ignorant of the numerous languages and dialects of the various tribes through which they passed. Neither has any white man ever crossed the boundary of that first of the Mohammedan negro states, from Sierra Leone or Liberia, which lie below the Gambia. Mr. Seymour, a mulatto man of education and enterprise, originally from Hartford, went on foot from Monrovia, about four years ago, to near the southern confines of Footah, and found a varied, rich, and populous country, with numerous towns and villages, immense fields of rice, cotton, corn, vegetables, etc.; the people industrious and hospitable, manufacturing their clothes and iron, with regular fairs for the purchase and sale of numerous articles of domestic and foreign production. As one evidence of the erroneous impressions common in the world respecting the habits of Africans, it may be mentioned that in that region, as in Yoruba, (a country fifteen hundred or two thousand miles distant from it,) the women not only sweep their houses frequently, but carry the dust outside of the gates of the towns.

"Old Paul" was born in the southern part of Footah, and in his early childhood used to bring water in a calabash to his mother from the Cabah, one of the head streams of the Jalibah. He afterward lived in the cities of Kebbe, or Kibby, and Bundu, where he spent many years in studying under different masters. On several occasions he accompanied caravans and armies on mercantile and military expeditions into adjacent and more distant countries, and his accounts of these abound in details of great novelty and interest. The same may be said of his communications on the history, customs, arts, religions, learning, languages, books, schools, teachers, travelers, productions, trade, etc., of the mixed people among whom he lived. In respect to its varied population, his country resembles the unexplored regions before mentioned, lying between it and the sea-coast; but as Footah is a Mohammedan country, the religion of the false prophet affords a bond of union strong enough to hold the heterogeneous multitude under one government, and generally in the peaceful enjoyment of the laws, arts, and learning which belong to a Mohammedan community, being provided for by the Koran and claimed by its believers. When we bear in mind that the chief attributes of God and some of the principles of morality were copied into that book from the Hebrew Scriptures, we may realize something of the difference between Mohammedan and Pagan countries in Africa. One great advantage of the former consists in the use of letters. Arabic is taught in schools wherever the priests can find pupils; and such is their proselyting spirit, or rather (as we may truly say of many of them) their humane desire to diffuse the faith in which they conscientiously believe, that they are sometimes seen in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and other places far from their homes, teaching children to write the Arabic characters on the sand.

Paul was a schoolmaster in Footah, after pursuing a long course of preparatory studies, and said that he had an aunt who was much more learned than himself, and eminent for her superior acquirements and for her skill in teaching. Schools, he said, were generally established through the country, provision being made by law for educating children of all classes, the poor being taught gratuitously. All the details of the system he was ready to give in answer to inquiries, including the

methods, rules, books, etc. The books, of course, were all in manuscript; and what has seemed difficult of belief, even by well-informed persons in our country, several native African languages were written in Arabic characters. He gave a catalogue of about thirty books in his own mother tongue, (the Sereculy or Serrawolly,) with some account of their nature and contents.

In consequence of these interesting communications, applications have been repeatedly made by the writer for specimens of negro writings; and a few months ago he received, from President Benson and ex-President Roberts, several manuscripts of considerable length, written with neatness, uniformity, and elegance, which excite admiration. The compositions are original, having been written at Monrovia, at the request of those distinguished gentlemen, by accomplished negro Mohammedan travelers on visits there from the interior. They have been translated by the Rev. Dr. Bird, of Hartford, and contain evidence of a sincere religious zeal in the writers, who address their solemn appeals to the unknown stranger who had requested a written communication from them, presuming, as it appears, that he was not a Moslem, and was, therefore, ignorant of his Maker, his obligations to him, and the importance of knowing and serving him. Some passages in those documents would be perfectly appropriate to a sermon, even in an American pulpit, except that the idea of a Saviour is not expressed; but there are other parts which display the extreme ignorance of the writers respecting countries distant from their own. One of the manuscripts gives a description of China, full of the greatest extravagance, showing a degree of childish misconception and credulity which might be thought a proof of negro mental imbecility had we not in our hands Sir John Maundevill's Travels. That book, which was most extensively read in various languages in Europe four centuries ago, contains descriptions and pictures of men with two heads, and various other monsters, reported to be the inhabitants of fabulous countries, or lands barely known by name.

The following interesting account we copy from the Rev. William Fox's History of the Wesleyan Missions in Western Africa, page 462. It relates incidents of his journey to Footah-Bundu, where he attempted to establish a mission.

That is the part of the country where "Old Paul" completed his education. On arriving at Jumé, he says it is a Serawolly (or Sereculy) town, "somewhat noted as being the residence of a Marraboo priest, named Kabba, who has scholars from different parts of the country. He was busy with his pupils, but immediately came to give us a hearty welcome, and soon after he sent me three fowls. Here our guide gave a history of our proceedings from Kanipe to this place. After he had done the priest commenced a prayer for us; the people, with their hands upon their foreheads, as on former occasions, saying, at the end of every sentence, 'Amín! amín!'"

On the next day, which was Sunday, Mr. Fox says "the priest was busy all the day, so that I had not an opportunity of speaking to him until the evening, when I presented him with a handsomely bound Arabic Testament, and held a lengthy conversation with him on the subject of experimental religion, in the presence of a large congregation."

The next day, continues the narrator, "we rose early, and went to the priest to procure a guide. . . . Soon after the interview I accompanied the Mohammedan scribe to see his brother, who was sick, at whose request I prayed. . . . This place is one of the strongholds of the Mohammedan creed. . . . A little before five P. M., the guide being ready, I immediately mounted, and we were in the act of starting; but the priest thought proper to give us his blessing, which he did by taking hold of my hands while on horseback, and saying something which I did not understand; but the people around us were all attention, and they stood with both their hands open, as if they expected something to fall from the clouds at the close of the ceremony; and, as before, they all said, *Amín! amín!* We now proceeded, upward of one hundred of the inhabitants, men, women, and children, following us, sometimes completely surrounding my horse, wishing me to shake hands with them. I did so until I was tired, and ultimately was obliged to gallop off."

The following passages from the Arabic manuscripts above referred to will interest the reader. They are extract from Dr. Bird's translation of an Arabic manuscript, written in Monrovia, by a negro from the interior, at the request of President Benson, of Liberia, for a gentleman in New York.

The manuscript begins, like the chapters of the Koran, and all common Arab writings, with these words: "In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful," and adds: "May God bless our lord Mohammed, his prophet, and guard him and his disciples, and give him peace abundantly." Then follow several pages on "the Origin of Man," in which the creative power and the wisdom and benevolence of God are magnified; after which the writer proceeds thus:

And God said: "O children of Adam, when you arrive at the age of ten you are bordering on the years of men and women, and you will be expected to attend prayers and preaching, and bear testimony, and not fear the Day of Judgment. You will be tempted by men, who will say: Pursue the ways of sin and disobedience and forgetfulness of what I, the Merciful, have enjoined upon you times without number. O man of thirty years, reckon not yourself a little child, but a man grown. Attend to your fasts, your prayers, day and night; and, if you continue thus day and night, you will be reckoned among the excellent of men, being, in secret and before the world, the same. Son of Adam, if you have come to forty years you have attained your full strength. The marks of full age bear witness to this; your vigor is ripe, your mind is mature; what you have learned is written well on your memory. Guard against wine, and the indulgence of impurity. And then, thou son of fifty years, thou knowest the advantages thy love to the faith hath procured thee. It has brought thee into the society of the great, and it has pleased Him who is the possessor of all excellency and power. Thou son of sixty years, from the decline of your strength your passions are cooled. Look at your noon of life, and judge how far your life and death are in your power; and, if you have not given up your hope in the word of God's prophet, (may God bless him!) you will have established for yourself a good household in these sixty years. O ye who heed not what shall come upon you, take care how you put any one in partnership with God; for this is a dangerous sin, like that of the spilling of blood. O thou son of seventy years, estimate not yourself from the length of your past life, but from the nearness of your death. O thou man of ninety, death is coming upon you with power; but there is no pain in Paradise. O man of a hundred, worn out with a hundred cares; thou who hast challenged to thyself the age of Noah, peace be on thee! Alas! alas! how wilt thou meet thy reward and thy Rewarder? The Most High has brought your stewardship to a close, according to the word of the Lord, who thus testifies to every man who has a heart and an ear: 'O ye old men, remember that the seed, after it has sprouted forth, and before the harvest, dies.' O ye young people, how many that began life have been removed before growing up! Where is Charon and his host? They have

perished. Where is Shadad-ibn-Aad and his host? They have perished. Where are Pharaoh, the accursed, and his host? They have perished. Where are Nimrod, son of Canaan, and his host? Where are the sons and daughters, fathers and mothers of the past idolaters? All perished. Where are your own fathers and mothers, ancient and modern? They also have all perished; and be assured that your end will be the same as theirs."

This passage in the manuscript is followed by several pages of fabulous names and dates professing to be historical, and extravagant accounts of animals, the heavenly bodies, etc., in which mystical numbers are connected with childish errors and impossible events in great confusion. It would seem as if the author had endeavored to write on different subjects of which he once had read or heard, but, being far from his books, remembered correctly only the religious doctrines, which had made a clearer impression on his mind.

The following are extracts from the translation of a manuscript received from ex-President Roberts. This also is written with great elegance and correctness, the proper names being in red ink, and the points carefully marked. This manuscript occupies sixteen letter sheet pages; the other eighteen.

In the name of God, most merciful and gracious, may God bless our lord Mohammed.

Thanks be to God, who is worthy of all gratitude and praise, the forgiver of sins, the possessor of the throne of glory, who created all things by himself, who created death and life, and created the earth and the heavens, and made all creatures in heaven and in the earth, who made the race of man from water; then he made the blood, the heart, and the bones, then he spread the flesh upon the bones, then he added the tendons. Then said God, (be he exalted,) who created you from the ground and from water, that we might show and confirm through mercy what we wish to every generation. . . . O ye people, know ye that God is merciful toward you; but that coming day will be terrible to the unbelievers, who live not as though there were a God, nor as if we were going to return to him. . . . O ye people, fear God and serve your Lord. Do your good works before the dissolution of death. . . . That day, God has said, nothing will profit you but a pure heart. . . . Beware, yea, beware, lest you hear the truth without repenting, and thus debase yourself. If you are asleep, be roused; if you are ignorant, make inquiry; if you are forgetful, refresh your memory; for here are the learned, ready to instruct you; and, said he, on whom be peace, seek after knowledge. Well then, you may say, for example, give us a description of China, ye men of knowledge.

China. China is a distant country, so that, though you have

shoes of iron, they would be worn out before you reach it. The name of the Sultan is Aivor. It is said that the journey between Medina and China is one of five years. Some say five hundred years. There are in China ten mountains. One of them has on it two trees, one of which can cover all the people of the country with its shadow; at the same time, if a single man seeks a shelter under it, the shadow covers him and no more. . . . In China are found two kettles, in one of which they cook for all the inhabitants of the country, and they all eat their fill, and there is none too much. In the other they do cooking for strangers if they come among them, and they eat and are satisfied, and there is nothing over. There are in China two serpents, etc., etc.

After a few more such remarkable and incredible statements the writer says:

This account of China may possibly be considered a blemish on this book; but such is the character of the country, on the authority of the learned.

He then commences a long and solemn appeal to the unknown person in whose name he had been requested to send something in writing, and whom he appears to have supposed to be ignorant of the first principles of religion, but for whom he feels an affectionate regard.

O my brother's son, do not join yourself with Satan, for Satan is your enemy, as God, the exalted, has said—for Satan is your enemy; and will you make partnership with your enemy? . . . O, my brother's son, let not the affairs of this life draw away your affections. Follow not the wind; do not deceive yourself, but be prepared, before sickness, or poverty, or old age engross your attention. God, the exalted, says, O man! who has set you against your Lord, who created, shaped, and adjusted you, and put you together in the form that pleased him? God, the exalted, says that the life of this world is of very little profit in the world to come.

The following are extracts from a letter sent to "Old Paul" by a venerable old slave, long known at Fayetteville, N. C., and there called "Morro," in reply to one addressed to him, in 1836:

In the name of God, the compassionate, etc. I am not able to write my life. I have forgotten much of the language of the Arabs. I read not the grammatical, and but little of the common dialect. I ask thee, O brother, to reproach me not, for my eyes are weak, and my body also. [He was then about seventy-one years of age.]

My name is Omar-ben-Sayeed. The place of my birth is Footah-

Toro, between the two rivers. [Probably the Senegal and Gambia, or the Senegal and Niger, in their upper parts.] The teachers of Bundu-foota were a sheik, named Mohammed-Sayeed, my brother, and the sheik Soleyman Kimba, and the sheik Jebraeel-Abdel. I was teacher twenty-five years. There came a great army to my country. They killed many people. They took me to the sea, and sold me in the hands of the Christians, who bound me, and sent me on board of a great ship. And we sailed a month and half a month, when we came to a place called Charleston in the Christian language. Here they sold me to a small, weak, and wicked man named Johnson, a complete infidel, who had no fear of God at all. Now I am a small man, and not able to do hard work. So I fled from the hand of Johnson, and, after a month, came to a place where I saw some houses. On the new moon I went into a large house to pray; a lad saw me, and rode off to the place of his father, and informed him that he had seen a black man in the great house. A man named Handah, (Hunter,) and another man with him, on horseback, came, attended by a troop of dogs. They took me and made me go with them twelve miles, to a place called Faydill, (Fayetteville,) where they put me in a great house, from which I could not go out. I continued in the great house, which in the Christian language they call *jail*, sixteen days and nights. One Friday the jailer came and opened the door, and I saw a great many men, all of them Christians, some of whom called out, What is your name? I did not understand their Christian language.

A man called Bob Mumford took me and led me out of the jail, and I was very well pleased to go with them to their place. I staid at Mumford's four days and nights, and then a man named Jim Owen, son-in-law of Mumford, who married his daughter Betsy, asked me if I was willing to go to a place called Bladen. I said yes, I was willing. I went with them, and have remained on the place of Jim Owen until now.

O people of North Carolina! O people of South Carolina! O people of America, all of you! you have a righteous man among you named James Owen, and with him John Owen. These are pious men. All that they ate I ate; as they dressed I dressed. James and his brother read to me the Gospel. God our Lord, our creator, our king, the arbiter of our condition, the bountiful, opened to my heart the right way.

The translator remarked as follows on the style of writing in the manuscript:

The narrative is very obscure in language, the writer, as he himself declares, being ignorant of the grammatical forms. . . . It is written in a plain and, with few exceptions, very legible *Moghrebby*, or western Arabic character. . . . It affords an idea of the degree of education among the Moslem blacks, when we see a man like this able to read and write a language so different

from his own native tongue. Where is the youth, or even the adult, among the mass of our people who is able to do the same in Latin or Greek?

By a fortunate incident the writer of one of the first-mentioned manuscripts from Liberia added at the end half a page in some language unknown to the translator, but doubtless some African tongue; thus affording evidence of the interesting fact, so little known in our country, that native languages are written in Arabic characters.

Art. VI.—THE PRISON ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK.

The society whose name stands at the head of this article has completed the nineteenth year of its existence and labors. During all that period it has pursued a career of quiet and unobtrusive but effective beneficence, and has received the benedictions of thousands who were ready to perish, but have been reclaimed, redeemed, and restored to themselves, to society, and to virtuous and useful industry through its agency. We propose in the present paper, of necessity, in a very summary way, to trace the history of this excellent and worthy organization, and to show both what it proposes and what it has accomplished in the improvement of our penal institutions, and in the reformation and elevation of the degraded, vicious, and fallen portion of humanity.

The Association has published eighteen Annual Reports, and the nineteenth will doubtless be issued in a few days. These embody, besides a connected history of its own labors, numerous letters, speeches, and essays of unsurpassed ability, and of the highest authority, on all the great questions connected with prison discipline, prison reform, and the administration of penal justice. It would be difficult, we think, to find a collection of papers on topics of this nature more philosophical in their cast, more comprehensive in their range of inquiry and discussion, more enlightened and liberal in their doctrines, more humane in their spirit, more vigorous in conception, more classical in style, or better adapted to elevate, improve, and render effective, in the production of the noblest

results, the administration of criminal law and penal justice. It is, as a matter of course, this series of reports which we make the basis of the present article.

The Prison Association owes its origin to the Board of Prison Inspectors of the State of New York, who, in November, 1844, through their president, Hon. John W. Edmonds, issued a card in the public papers, setting forth the occasion and necessity for such an organization. This card was accompanied by a call for a public meeting, signed by many of the most eminent citizens of New York, among whom may be mentioned Benjamin F. Butler, William Kent, John Duer, Ogden Hoffman, Daniel Lord, James Harper, John A. Dix, Robert B. Minturn, and the Rev. Drs. James Milnor, Gardiner Spring, Jonathan W. Wainwright, and Orville Dewey.

The proposed meeting was held on the evening of December 6 ensuing, the Hon. Wm. T. M'Coun, Vice-Chancellor of the State, presiding. As soon as the meeting had been organized Judge Edmonds submitted the following resolution, namely:

Resolved, That it is expedient to form, in the city of New York, a Prison Association, and that a committee be appointed by the Chair to report to this meeting a form of such association, and a nomination of suitable officers therefor.

Judge Edmonds supported his resolution in a lucid and able address. He presented a mass of interesting and instructive facts and statistics, gathered during his service as State Prison Inspector. He showed the almost insuperable difficulties encountered by discharged convicts in obtaining employment; the fearful alternative presented to them by society to starve or steal, and the well-nigh irresistible temptation thence arising to continue in a career of evil doing; the abundant streams of crime issuing from poverty, ignorance, sudden temptation, evil associations, youthful inexperience, insanity, and mental imbecility; the hardening and degrading influence of severity, and the softening, elevating, reformatory effect of kindness in the treatment of prisoners; the necessity and good results of the classification of convicts, and of their instruction as well in secular as religious knowledge; the hopeful nature of the work contemplated by the new organiza-

tion; the suppression of crime by raising and reforming the fallen, and the need of a thorough reform in the principles and modes of prison discipline. He also mentioned some startling facts demonstrative of the excessive, and even appalling, cruelties sometimes inflicted upon the convicts by the authorities of Auburn Prison. The Rev. William H. Channing seconded the resolution of Judge Edmonds, and enforced it in a train of remarks similar to those of the mover, in which he particularly showed that prisons ought to be made houses of reform rather than places of torment, and that society *owes* to criminals aid and support in their efforts to reform, since it is itself, by its neglects and injustice, in part at least, responsible for their crimes.

The resolution was adopted, and a committee appointed to draft a constitution and nominate officers.

Theodore Sedgwick, Esq., then moved the following resolution, which was carried unanimously:

Resolved, That it is proper that such society should have in view the condition and interest of persons arrested for crime and detained for trial, and after trial, until their commitment to their final place of confinement, and particularly of juvenile offenders.

Professor J. L. Tellkampf, then a citizen of the United States, but since chief inspector of prisons in the kingdom of Prussia, offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the state and condition of prison discipline, including the treatment which prisoners receive during their confinement, the melioration of the condition of prisoners, the improvement of the government of our prisons, and the substitution in their management of the law of kindness for that of force, are objects worthy the attention of philanthropists, and deserve the particular consideration of such a society.

Prof. Tellkampf supported his motion by a written address of much learning and power. He discussed at length the separate and silent methods of prison discipline, more commonly known at that time as the Philadelphia and Auburn systems. As between the two systems, he gave the preference to the latter; but at the same time he advocated a third system, compounded of both the others—a sort of eclectic method—as upon the whole superior to either. He animadverted with emphasis upon the tendency of the Philadelphia system to

produce mental imbecility and insanity in prisoners, and upon the cruelties practiced in enforcing discipline under the Auburn plan. He was particularly earnest, not to say severe, upon the system of contract labor in prisons, as both wrong in principle and injurious in its influence upon the convicts, since it wholly overlooks their moral amelioration, and regards and treats them only as so much machinery to be employed in the production of money. He gave an interesting outline of a plan of prison discipline presented by himself to the Cabinet of Prussia and adopted by the government of that country, in which the houses of detention were to be constructed upon the separate plan; state lunatic asylums were to be erected for the reception of insane convicts, and the penitentiaries were to be organized in three departments: the first on principles similar to those of the Philadelphia system, and the other two on the Auburn plan. We believe that since Prof. Tellkampf has been officially connected with the prisons of Prussia he has become a full convert to the separate, as contradistinguished from the congregate system of prison discipline.

The professor's resolution was adopted.

Mr. Isaac T. Hopper then offered the following:

Resolved, That to sustain and encourage discharged convicts, who give satisfactory evidence of repentance and reformation, in their endeavors to lead honest lives, by affording them employment, and guarding them against temptation, is demanded of us, not only by the interests of society, but by every dictate of humanity.

Resolved, That in the formation of such a society it would be proper to have a female department, to be especially regardful of the interests and welfare of prisoners of that sex.

In supporting his resolutions Mr. Hopper, who, as prison inspector in Philadelphia, had had large experience among convicts, related several highly interesting cases of reformation, the effect of kind words discreetly spoken, and of kind acts judiciously bestowed. He said that he had personally aided as many as fifty young culprits to regain their character and standing, and he had the satisfaction of being able to state that only two of them had turned out badly. He added that he could not help mentioning a subject which often gave him great pain. He often saw in the papers accounts of young

people committed to prison for small offenses; in this way their characters were blasted, and they often became reckless and desperate. If those who prosecuted on such occasions would only make use of fatherly reproof and friendly advice and encouragement, he was confident that a very large portion of these delinquents might become useful and honored members of society.

After the adoption of Mr. Hopper's resolutions, the Society was organized under the name and title of "The Prison Association of New York," by the adoption of a constitution and by-laws, and the election of Vice-Chancellor William T. M'Coun as president, and Theodore Frelinghuysen, Benjamin F. Butler, John W. Edmonds, and Abraham Van Nest as vice-presidents. The officers were, a president, four vice-presidents, a treasurer, a corresponding secretary, a recording secretary, and a board of managers, called an "executive committee," which was subdivided into four standing committees, namely: a committee on finance, a committee on detentions, a committee on discharged convicts, and a committee on prison discipline.

The objects of the Association, as stated in the Constitution, and more fully in an appeal to the public by the Executive Committee, are three: I. A humane attention to persons arrested and held for examination or trial, including inquiry into the circumstances of their arrest and the crimes charged against them; the securing to the destitute and friendless strict justice in their cases, and protection from the depredations of unprincipled and unfaithful persons with whom he may come in contact. II. Encouragement and aid to discharged convicts in their efforts to reform and earn an honest living, by procuring situations for them, by providing them tools to enable them to commence business for themselves, and by keeping up a paternal oversight and friendly correspondence after they have been thus provided for. III. The reformation of prisons themselves, and the improvement of prison discipline and government; an object the most important of all, since it goes to the root of the matter, builds at the foundation, and purifies the streams in the fountain.

The first annual meeting of the Association was held in the Broadway Tabernacle, on the evening of December 5,

1845. It was an occasion of great interest. The Boston Prison Discipline Society, and the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, were present by their delegates, who presented interesting and valuable communications from the organizations which they represented. Addresses were made by several gentlemen, particularly one of great eloquence and power by the Hon. John Duer, in which he depicted, in vivid and appalling colors, the abuses prevalent in our prisons, more especially our city prisons, and pressed upon the conscience of every man and every woman in the community the duty of aiding in some way, either by personal effort or the contribution of money, or both, in the removal of those abuses and the reform of the prisons.

The report of the first year's labors shows that the Association had entered intelligently, industriously, and successfully upon its appropriate work. Mr. Isaac T. Hopper was appointed agent of the Society, with special reference to aiding the Detention and Discharged Convict Committees. A female department, in accordance with one of the resolutions before named, was organized, a house rented for the accommodation of this class of delinquents, and two matrons appointed to take charge of the establishment.

That part of the Society's labor which is bestowed upon persons detained for examination or trial is necessarily confined to the cities of New York and Brooklyn. The members of the Detention Committee, though pressed by the claims of private business, were zealous and active in the discharge of their duties in the cause of humanity. Their visits to the numerous detention prisons, including the two principal city prisons, were sufficiently frequent to give them a familiar acquaintance with their condition and government. They speak of them as a disgrace to the public authorities, as daily inflicting grievous wrong upon the community; as ill-constructed, ill-arranged, void of all proper system, costly in their maintenance, and baneful in the extreme in their moral influence. They congratulate themselves, however, on having accomplished some useful results in this field, particularly in the attention given to the cases of eighty boys who had been arrested, forty-eight of whom were restored to their parents or friends, and, it was hoped, to the path of rectitude and virtue.

The Discharged Convict Committee also labored assiduously in their appropriate function, and with no little encouragement and success. The great object here was to prevent released prisoners from relapsing into crime by securing them from the temptations of want, and affording them the means of obtaining an honest livelihood. Two hundred and twenty-nine discharged prisoners, male and female, were aided by furnishing them, to a less or greater extent, with board, clothing, tools to set up business for themselves, etc., etc. Eighty-three were provided with places, concerning seventy of whom the Association had received reports from their employers of their continued good conduct; a proportion, as the Report truly declares, beyond what might have been expected, and showing that much good can be done even to the fallen and the abandoned without any great expenditure of time or money —the main draft being upon the kindly sympathies of our nature, a fountain from which there ought to be a constant flow of living waters. It is a sad mistake to suppose that all convicted criminals are hopelessly depraved. This is so far from being the case that the greater part may, by kind and judicious encouragement, be won back to the ways of virtue, while the very same persons would, in all probability, by harshness and rigor be irretrievably plunged into the abyss of crime.

The Committee having charge of the department of Prison Discipline were particularly enjoined to visit and inspect the various prisons of the state. That they might be able to discharge this duty in a satisfactory manner they applied to the Legislature for an act of incorporation, with power to examine thoroughly both state and county prisons. The Assembly, with great unanimity, passed the necessary bill; but the Senate, either from jealousy of interference with state institutions, or ignorance of the real objects of the Association, refused its assent, and the bill was not enacted into a law. Nevertheless, the Committee, by courtesy and without authority of law, inspected not only the prisons of New York and Brooklyn, but also the State Prison at Sing Sing and some six or eight county prisons. They found, particularly in the city and county prisons, defects of a grave and glaring character; among which they enumerate the huddling together, in the same apartment, of prisoners of all grades and ages, and in some

instances of both sexes; filth, ill-ventilation, vermin, idleness, frequent change of officers, etc., etc. They found the associations of the prisons to be for evil and evil only, and the prisoners, including the man of gray hairs and the mere youth, the murderer and the vagrant, the expert and the novice, all herded together, and subjected to influences the most corrupting and ruinous. The Association, in this its First Annual Report, came out distinctly and emphatically in favor of solitary confinement in all detention prisons and county jails. They avow the opinion that whatever arguments may be used against the separate system for more protracted periods of confinement, that system is obviously and decidedly preferable for short ones.

In regard to the two leading systems of Prison Discipline which have divided the world, the solitary and the silent, the separate and the congregate, the Philadelphia and the Auburn, as they have been variously called, the Association declared itself not pledged to either, but disposed rather to advocate a plan combined of both, avoiding the evils of each, adopting their respective advantages, and attempting to mould from them a system which should receive the sanction of all humane persons, and be truly and emphatically national in its character. The congregate system had been too generally administered with harshness, rigor, and even cruelty, and these evils had been considered inseparable from this system. It was this consideration mainly that created so strong a prejudice against the congregate system in the several commissions from European States, sent out by their governments to inspect the prisons of the United States. The New York Prison Association, in their First Annual Report, took ground against the idea that the severity complained of was necessarily inherent in the congregate system, but maintained that it was due rather to the want of fitness and adequate qualification in the persons selected to administer it. In confirmation of this view, the Association refers to the House of Correction in Boston, where, during a period of twelve years, though more than seven thousand criminals had been received, many of them exceedingly depraved, not a single blow had been struck, and yet the best of discipline had been maintained. It also refers to efforts recently and successfully made to introduce a milder system of

government into the prison at Sing Sing. In the male prison, where the reform had been by slow and timid steps, the number of lashes per month had been reduced from three thousand to two hundred and fifty; and yet the prison was confessedly as well governed as before. But in the female prison, where the change was conducted with bolder and more rapid strides, the greatest success was attained and the highest encouragement afforded; for whereas previously the number of offenses against prison rules had been at the rate of four hundred and fifty per annum, now these offenses were reduced to forty; and yet the discipline of the prison was vastly superior to what it had been before. Where all had been disorder and anarchy a year ago, all now was order, quiet, and good government. These beneficial results were secured by laying aside the harsher features of the congregate system, and replacing them with the milder discipline of the separate system.

The second anniversary of the Prison Association, which was held in the Hall of the Stuyvesant Institute on the evening of the 22d of December, 1846, was no less interesting than the first. Representatives were present from the Philadelphia and Boston Prison Societies, and letters were read from many distinguished gentlemen, both of our own country and Europe, among which were communications from Governor Seward, and from Dr. Julius, of Berlin, and M. de Tocqueville, of France.

The Annual Report for this year is an able and highly encouraging document, showing that the Association had been no less industrious than the preceding year in the prosecution of its appropriate objects, and that the success attained was no less conspicuous and cheering. The prisons visited and examined during the year by competent committees were the three state prisons, the penitentiaries on Blackwell's Island and at Albany, the city prisons of New York and Brooklyn, and ten county jails.

In regard to the county prisons, the Report avers that, for all purposes other than security, the system is a failure; that safety indeed is, in almost all of them, the sole end in view; that reformation—the great object of imprisonment—is lost sight of; that moral corruption is the grand result attained

through their agency; that they are, to a great extent, nurseries and feeders to our penitentiaries and state prisons; and that, in short, so injurious in its consequences is the existing system of imprisonment, it is a question whether the interests of society would not be as effectively served by its abandonment as by its continuance. The opinion is expressed that our county prisons never can be what an enlightened regard to the public weal demands until they afford opportunities for reflection, instruction the inculcation of religious principles, and the formation of industrious habits. Now the difficulty in the way of a system which would secure these essential conditions lies in the small number of the convicts in most of our jails. To meet this difficulty the important suggestion is made that the state be divided into an adequate number of penal districts, in each of which, in some central position, a prison on the most improved plan should be erected, in which there should be introduced and effectively applied all the best agencies of reformation; as classification, labor, hygienic appliances, and adequate instruction, secular, industrial, moral, and religious.

The investigation of the penitentiary on Blackwell's Island, conducted by a very intelligent and able committee, of which the late distinguished Judge Duer was a member, revealed abuses and evils in the organization and management of that institution of the most flagrant and revolting character. Among these were: a total want of ventilation; an extreme filthiness and slovenliness in the dress and persons of the prisoners; the packing of two hundred women into a workshop whose dimensions were one hundred feet by seventy-five feet, with only the occasional supervision of a matron, where ribald jests, obscene talk, and horrid oaths were the order of the day, the whole forming a seething mass of corrupted and corrupting humanity; a female hospital, with an average population of one hundred and fifty patients, nearly all prostitutes, constituting in fact the great venereal hospital of the city, where these wretched outcasts are cured at the expense of the public, which is thus made to pay a direct and enormous tax for the support of licentiousness; the smallness of the proportion of prisoners required to work, the unproductiveness of their labor, and the looseness of the business management of the prison, not a

solitary article manufactured by the convicts having been accounted for; an utter want of fitness for their duties of many of the officials, as shown in the not infrequent use by them of language ordinarily heard only from the lowest and most abandoned, so that many of them, instead of being ensamples to the prisoners of moderation, sobriety, and decorum, were, on the contrary, violent, intemperate, vulgar, and profane; the introduction of political tests into the appointment of officers, and a consequent subjection of the executive administration of the prison to the control of party politics; the flooding of the island at all times with a promiscuous company, through a system of indiscriminate and almost unlimited permits to visit it issued by various grades of city officials, whereby discipline was materially interfered with, opportunities afforded for a flagrant abuse of the privilege, and what was designed to be simply and solely a penal institution perverted to the support and encouragement of the grossest licentiousness; the supervision, in part, of the female prisoners by male keepers, who were not only permitted, but required to lock up the females at night, and one of them at Bellevue, had the entire charge of his gang, day and night, to the number of sixty; and, finally, the want of adequate provision for the secular, moral, and religious instruction of the prison population. These and other abuses and deficiencies are set forth and animadverted upon with a just severity in the Report now under consideration.

But the most comprehensive, thorough, and satisfactory examinations of the penal institutions of the Commonwealth were those of the three State Prisons, Sing Sing, Auburn, and Clinton. A great improvement was reported in the condition and working of these institutions. The reign of cruelty seemed to have passed away, a great and radical change having taken place in the government of the state prisons within the three preceding years. The Clinton Prison, indeed, had from its origin (then quite recent) been thus well and wisely governed; and now, at Sing Sing and Auburn, where three year previously nearly one hundred blows a day had been struck, and the whipping post was never dry, weeks and even months elapsed without a blow. The infliction of corporal punishment had become infrequent, and he was considered the best officer who

had permitted the longest time to pass away without resorting to it. The following general facts were elicited by these investigations: That our state prisons had been erected at an expense exceeding $950,000; that they had accommodations for two thousand one hundred and fifty convicts, were governed by one hundred and sixteen officers, and involved an annual expenditure of more than $220,000; that they had been self-supporting, until certain highly profitable branches of industry previously pursued in them were prohibited by the Legislature,* and that they had become nearly so again; that only about one hundredth part of the large yearly outlay upon the prisons was directed to the moral and mental improvement of the prisoners, while the whole of the residue was devoted to material interests; that the system of government had been almost entirely one of physical force, but was now happily modified and improved from its former harshness and cruelty, and brought to a nearer conformity to the principles of reason and humanity; and that the plan of farming out the labor of the convicts, in other words, the contract system, though probably adapted to advance the financial prosperity of the prisons, has in it much that is calculated to interfere with the moral improvement of the prisoners, much that has a tendency to restore and perpetuate the former hard and iron rule. The method of investigation pursued by the committees charged with that duty was to have a personal interview with each prisoner, and to examine, under oath, the officers of the prison, and also the contractors and their clerks, to an extent sufficient to enable them to understand truly and fully the government and discipline, as well as the general condition and working of the institution.

The Detention and Discharged Convict Committees were assiduously and successfully engaged in the discharge of their respective duties, as well by their personal exertions as through their agent. A large number of persons detained for trial or examination received attention and relief, according to their several necessities. Of discharged convicts, five hundred and six were relieved by the Association to a less or greater extent,

* It is to be regretted that the Report does not specify the branches of labor thus forbidden by the Legislature, that we might know the cause of the prohibition, and judge of its propriety and wisdom.

two hundred and five of them being provided with permanent employment. Concerning far the greater part of these, good and encouraging accounts were received from their employers.

The application to the Legislature for a charter, whose failure was reported the preceding year, met with a better fate on its renewal this year. A charter of a liberal and comprehensive character was granted, one which imposes grave duties and confers high powers. Among the duties imposed is that of "visiting, inspecting, and examining all the prisons in the state, and reporting annually to the Legislature their state and condition, and all such other things concerning them as may enable the Legislature to perfect their government and discipline." Among the powers conferred is that of "establishing a work-house in the county of New York," and that of "examining on oath any of the officers of the prisons, and to converse with any of the prisoners therein, without the presence of the keepers or any of them." To enable them to carry into effect the first-named of these powers, the Association presented an elaborate and earnest memorial to the Common Council, praying for a grant of money to that end. This application was for a considerable period renewed from year to year, but without effect. No appropriation of money was ever made to the Association for this object. Nevertheless, in the year 1849, and no doubt as the result of the Society's efforts, a work-house was established on Blackwell's Island. This greatly desired object was directly accomplished through Judge Edmonds, one of the originators, and long an honored and useful member of the Prison Association, acting in his official capacity as a civil magistrate.

The Fourth Annual Report of the Association, which records the transactions of two years, (1847 and 1848,) shows a prosecution of its appropriate work equally vigorous and successful as before.

During the two years covered by this Report the work of prison inspection was carried out with vigor, although obstructions were interposed in reference to the Sing Sing prison which resulted in preventing any examination of that institution. The two other state prisons, Auburn and Clinton, were visited and examined. A great advance is reported in the humane character of the discipline of those prisons. The

officers, with few exceptions, were found to be intelligent, capable, and humane; and, as a general thing, they were respected and esteemed by the convicts. Both the number of prison offenses and the amount and severity of punishment had very sensibly diminished. After a searching examination of all the convicts, but one instance of barbarity was discovered in the Auburn prison, showing a state of things which contrasted favorably with that of former years. And although, owing to the bitter and persistent opposition of the warden of Sing Sing prison, no examination was permitted there, it was ascertained without such examination that, since the organization of the Prison Association, and doubtless as the result of its agency, the number of monthly violations of prison rules had diminished from one hundred and fifteen to sixty-six, and the number of lashes given per month from one thousand one hundred and twenty-one to thirty-eight; while at the same time the average prices of convict labor per day had increased from thirty-one cents to forty-five cents; showing very clearly that kindness, by promoting a contented and cheerful spirit in the convicts, had, in equal proportion, augmented their productive industry.

The favorable influence of the Prison Association on the feelings, hopes, aims, and purposes of the convicts in our state prisons, had been, according to the Report under consideration, decided and conspicuous. It had shown them that, though they were fallen and debased, there were still those in the community who cared for them, sympathized with them, and were willing and anxious to co-operate with them in their efforts to reform. This conviction carried with it at once a soothing and quickening influence upon convicts, tranquilizing their minds, and stirring them up to resolutions and efforts looking to a reformation of life. A no less beneficial effect had been produced upon prison officers by the agency of the Association. They had thereby been incited to greater diligence in the discharge of their official duties, and moved to a more humane treatment of the prisoners under their care and control.

Twenty county prisons had been examined by committees of the Association, which were found to be in the same deplorable condition, and to be exerting the same corrupting and ruinous influence upon their inmates as the prisons previously reported upon.

The work of looking after detained and providing situations for discharged prisoners had been pursued with no less diligence and success than in former years.

A service of the highest importance and value had, in 1847, been rendered to the community by the Prison Association. During the previous year a new Constitution had been framed and put in operation in the State of New York. As the said Constitution had materially changed the system of prison government, it became necessary to adopt the statute law to the requirements of the new organic law. Accordingly, in the session of 1847 and 1848, bills were early introduced into both houses of the Legislature with a view to securing such adaptation. As these bills were framed to meet the requirements of the Constitution rather than with a view to improvement in penal discipline, the Association felt it to be their duty, as a fitting occasion had arisen, to propose such alterations in the laws, in relation to this subject, as the progress of civilization and the best interests of the State seemed to require. A committee was accordingly appointed, consisting of John Duer, John W. Edmonds, Benjamin F. Butler, John D. Russ, and Rensselaer N. Havens, to consider and report what alterations and improvements could be advantageously proposed. The committee, embracing, as our readers will have noticed, some of the ablest jurists in the country, found the statutes relating to this subject scattered over a legislation of so many years that it was difficult, in many instances, even to discover what the law really was. Under such circumstances, it was believed by the committee that they could render a more important service to the state, as well as more completely effect their own object in the advancement of the interests of humanity, by collecting, arranging, and consolidating into one act the then existing laws, availing themselves, however, at the same time, of the opportunity to suggest and introduce such amendments as they might judge necessary and proper. This was truly a Herculean task; but the Committee, prompted by a noble patriotism and philanthropy, and with no hope of reward other than the consciousness of doing good, undertook and accomplished the labor; and the result was the very thorough, elaborate, comprehensive, and admirable bill, which the Legislature of 1847 enacted into a law, creating and fixing the present

prison system of New York. Thus has the Prison Association brought the state under a weighty obligation of gratitude for essential aid rendered in the important work of improving its criminal jurisprudence.

The labors and operations of the Prison Association for the year 1849 are detailed in their Fifth Annual Report. The unhappy controversy between the Association and the Board of State Prison Inspectors, reported as having commenced the preceding year, was continued with increased emphasis, we might almost say bitterness, during the year now under review, and for a number of years subsequently. Into the merits of this controversy our space will not permit us, and our inclination forbids us, to enter. We will, however, venture a single remark. The Association appears to us to be fully sustained by its charter of incorporation in its claims of a right to inspect the prisons, and, in so doing, to converse with the prisoners separate and apart from the keepers or any of them: at the same time, it seems to us, nevertheless, to have committed a grave indiscretion—and one likely to produce (as in fact it did) increased irritation and opposition—in spreading, year after year, upon the pages of its Annual Reports an unlimited quantity of the tales received from convicts discharged from Sing Sing Prison, whose truth there had been, under the circumstances, no opportunity of testing. Although this controversy continued for many years, and its effects reached even beyond its own existence, materially circumscribing the operations of the Association and crippling its usefulness, so far as the duty of prison inspection prescribed by the Legislature was concerned, all that has now ceased, and we consider it a fit subject of congratulation that at the present time the most cordial relations exist between the Prison Association and the Board of Inspectors, and indeed between the Association and the prison authorities, in all the different classes of prisons throughout the State.

With the exception of prison inspection, which, during the year 1849, was limited to the city of New York and its immediate vicinity, the Association pursued its accustomed work, particularly in examining complaints, looking after the arrested, and providing situations for the discharged, with its usual energy and success.

With keen and piercing glance it peered into the numerous abuses and defects in the administration of criminal justice in New York, and with fearless heart and trenchant hand exposed them in its Report. It still found the city prison, (the Tombs,) to use its own language, "literally, and without exaggeration, a moral pest-house," and the penitentiary on Blackwell's Island "one of the worst governed prisons in Christendom."

There is, however, one redeeming institution, one bright spot amid the general gloom. The work-house system, for which the Society had so long, so intelligently, and so earnestly labored, went into operation on Blackwell's Island this year. It opened on the 14th day of June with thirty-seven inmates, and the commitments from that date to December 31 inclusive swelled to four hundred and twenty-five. The new institution had many difficulties to struggle with in the commencement of its career. Nevertheless, the Report uses in reference to it the following strongly encouraging language: "This new establishment, from the character of its organization, and the wisdom, energy, and skill with which it is conducted, promises to be the most interesting as well as orderly and successful institution in our city. It has now only been in operation since the 15th of June, and already the receipts, with only about two hundred and fifty convicts, average about $2,000 a week, or over $100,000 a year, a greater amount than is earned by the eight hundred in the Penitentiary." Thus were the zeal and the arguments of the Association in favor of the establishment of a work-house more than justified by the result. Mr. Harmon Eldridge, a gentleman thoroughly imbued with the doctrines of the Association on the subject of prison discipline and in full sympathy with them, was, through its influence, appointed superintendent of the new establishment. In a letter, dated Jan. 1, 1850, addressed to a committee of the Association, he says: "I have no hesitation in saying, from daily and careful observation, that with buildings properly adapted for a work-house with a view to the classification of the various grades of character, and with stringent rules and regulations for its good government, that it will not only improve the moral condition of its inmates, but it will be more satisfactory to the tax-payers of the city of New York. A work-house will improve the penitentiary system in various ways. It will enable you to separate

crime and poverty, or, in other words, the 'court prisoners' from the vagrants. It will relieve the penitentiary of more than half its population, and remove the embarrassments created by its present crowded state."

We regret that the limits to which any one paper in this journal must be confined will forbid our following the Prison Association, year by year, along the entire track of its honorable and useful career in the work of reforming prisoners, and the still more important work of reforming the prisons themselves. Both these objects were prosecuted with much zeal and vigor, and the latter in the way of prison inspection as extensively as the limited means at command would permit, during the first ten or twelve years of the Society's existence. During the last six or eight years of its history, as we learn from the Reports of those years, owing to a want of funds for the purpose, and perhaps also from some decay of zeal in the cause, the work of visiting, inspecting, and examining prisons has been almost totally suspended. In all that time, no State prison or penitentiary, and but very few county jails, have been examined and reported on.

But while this branch of the society's work appears to have fallen into some degree of neglect, that department of its labors which embraces the cities of New York and Brooklyn, which is directed to the care and reformation of detained and discharged prisoners, has been conducted by Mr. Abraham Beal, general agent of the Association, with eminent industry, zeal, wisdom, energy, and success. Mr. Beal has, from year to year and from day to day, systematically visited the various prisons and detention houses in these two cities, attended upon the criminal courts, and given special attention to such cases as seemed to call for his interposition. The child or youth of tender years, the novice in crime, the emigrant to whom our language and laws are unknown, the wrongfully arrested, the guilty but penitent prisoner, and those in whose cases mitigating circumstances are found to exist, have received from him, as the representative of the Association, that consideration which philanthropy should bestow upon the young, the weak, the ignorant, the tempted, and the unfortunate. To show the extraordinary activity and devotion of this gentleman, we present to our readers a summary statement of his labors for a sin-

gle year. We select that of 1861. During that year he visited six thousand one hundred and fifty persons, comparatively poor and helpless, in our city and detention prisons. He examined one thousand three hundred and thirty-eight complaints, giving counsel and aid to the persons against whom they had been made. He procured the abandonment of four hundred and sixty-one complaints, most of which were the result of prejudice or passion, or too trivial to be entertained. He procured the discharge of five hundred and six persons, either very young or clearly innocent, or manifestly penitent and resolved to sin no more. He assisted with board and aided to reach their friends or employment remote from the city six hundred and seventy-six discharged convicts. He supplied with clothing, less or more, one hundred and fifty-two others of the same class. And he procured work, in town or country, for two hundred and forty-one released prisoners. This is a catalogue of labors for a single year, which places in a very clear point of view both the zeal and usefulness of this devoted philanthropist.

There is a feature in the work of the Association, as conducted by their general agent, of very great importance and utility, and which ought to be distinctly brought before the public eye. It is well known that in some countries there are regularly constituted tribunals called Courts of Conciliation, the design of which is to prevent as well family and neighborhood feuds as tedious and expensive litigation, by an amicable settlement of differences. The labors of the Society's agent supply, in a great measure, the want of such a court in this community. Innumerable difficulties, originating in mistake, passion, drink, sudden temptation, or the like, many of which would otherwise grow to formidable proportions, are adjusted through his agency. In this way husbands and wives temporarily alienated are reunited in feeling; hostile parties are reconciled; offenders are reclaimed; much expense is saved to the community; and the sum total of human happiness is greatly augmented. These, and such as these, are declared in the last Annual Report to be every-day results of Mr. Beal's judicious interposition; results, as the Report truly adds, most important in themselves, as well as cheering to every humane and philanthropic heart.

The economic relations and bearings of the Prison Association constitute an aspect of it well worthy of attention. We conscientiously believe that, as a measure of public economy, the wealthier part of our citizens, who have the bulk of the taxes to pay, cannot lay out a portion of their money to better advantage than in aiding this society in its work. While the Association thus far has cost the community less than $50,000, there can be no doubt that it has saved it hundreds of thousands in a diminished expenditure for the administration of criminal justice on the one hand, and, on the other, in the accumulations of an industry which would otherwise, at least a considerable part of it, have been but a negative quantity. The Association, then, in a merely economic view, must be regarded as a great public and social benefit, since it costs far less to prevent crime than to punish it; and the prevention of crime by raising the fallen is the foundation principle of this organization. The surest and cheapest protection to society against the bad is to make them good; a result which, by the blessing of God on honest and patient effort, can be effected, as experience has shown, in a much larger number of cases than is commonly supposed possible; for be it known to our readers that all is not evil within the walls of our prisons, any more than all is good outside of those walls. Self-interest, therefore, even if there were no higher motive, should enlarge the charities of the benevolent toward the guilty and the fallen. They return to society, on their discharge, either pirates or penitents; and it lies mainly with society itself to say which it shall be.

We find in the last Annual Report the following paragraph:

The Association has made an important modification in its arrangements during the past year. We have long felt the need—indispensable to the most effective prosecution of our work—of an Executive Officer who would devote his whole time and energies to the interests of the Society. We have accordingly invited to the office of Corresponding Secretary, heretofore rather nominal and honorary than otherwise, the Rev. E. C. Wines, D.D., late President of the City University of St. Louis. He has accepted the position tendered him, and has entered upon the discharge of its duties. It will be the business of the Corresponding Secretary, besides providing the needful funds, to carry on an extended correspondence, both in our own country and Europe, with gentlemen connected with the administration of penal justice; to collect and examine reports of penal institutions at home and abroad; to present our cause in such pulpits as may be open to him; to

inspect and examine prisons; to make himself familiar with the doings of other organizations similar to our own, and with the whole range of penal literature; and to digest, arrange, and render available, in tabulated and other forms, the statistics of crime gathered from all quarters.

As the writer of the present article is the incumbent of the said office, it would be a violation of modesty for him to say more than that, under the new arrangement, the Association has entered with ardor upon a broader field of labor than heretofore, and one more in accordance with the original design of its formation. For the first time within its history pecuniary aid has been obtained, both from the city and state governments, and there was a prospect, as stated in the last Report, that every prison in the state, of whatever grade, would be visited and thoroughly explored within the current year, and the results reported to the Legislature in the next annual communication to that body. This promise, we have reason to think, will be redeemed.

We find, in the Report for 1862, the following summation of results accomplished by the Association during the eighteen years of its existence: 54,714 detained prisoners visited and counseled; 5,630 detained prisoners discharged on the recommendation of the Association; 18,911 complaints examined; 4,908 complaints withdrawn at the instance of the Society; 7,676 discharged convicts aided with money or clothing, or both; 2,729 discharged convicts provided with situations; and seventy inspections of prisons made. Less than five per cent. of those provided with situations have ever returned to prison, according to the best information obtained; and a very large proportion appear to have been thoroughly reclaimed, and those of them who are still living are pursuing a career of virtuous and useful industry.

The Executive Committee close their eighteenth Annual Report in these words:

> The appeal of the criminal and the prisoner is to that high and noble philanthropy which can overlook the past and stoop to raise the fallen; that philanthropy which whispers words of consolation to the erring, and guides the feet of the wanderer back into the path of virtue. It is a philanthropy akin to that Divine benevolence which, in calling backsliders to return, promises to "heal their backslidings;" nay, even to be "merciful to their unrighteousness," and to "remember their sins and iniquities no more."

It is to such a philanthropy that we would appeal in behalf of the discharged convict. We say to society: "Give him another chance. Speak kindly to him. Let him have your sympathy. Meet him with a smile instead of a frown. Open the heart and the hand to his relief. He starts at his own shadow. He feels that, like Cain, he is a 'fugitive and a vagabond upon the earth.' Terrible indeed are his struggles; for he has foes within as well as without to combat. His soul is driven to and fro between the frowns of the world and the upbraidings of conscience. These awaken remorse; those despair. Does not a being thus agitated and distressed need sympathy and encouragement? And shall his appeal, shall our appeal for him, be in vain to those whom a kind Providence has guarded in the hours of temptation, and whose cup overflows with blessings? Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, at once so condescending and so gracious: 'I was in prison, and ye came unto me:' 'inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'"

Art. VII.—JAMES FLOY, D.D.

The life-stories of the great and good are among the most valuable treasures of the commonwealth of humanity. They at once supply the incentives to noble actions, and show the methods by which such actions may be made effective of the greatest good. This general truth is, however, especially and most emphatically applicable in the associations of religious life. The Church is strengthened and made effective by the active devotion of her living members, while her garnered wealth is constantly augmented by the unforgotten virtues of life and character of those who have finished their course and entered upon their reward. As the children of a provident father are first served and blessed by him while living, and at his dying are endowed with his treasured wealth, so the living members of the militant Church are not only profited by their godly services, but they also have each an inheritance in the good name and remembered excellencies of those who have lived and died in the faith. Hence the high value that has ever been accorded to Christian biography, and the occasion for the careful diligence with which the Church collects and transmits the mem-

ories of her departed worthies. With such reflections we have prepared the following sketch of one whom God had richly gifted, and who, dying, has left his name and reputation to the custody and the enriching of his Church.

James Floy, D.D., late of the New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York, August 20, 1806. His father was English by birth, and a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church. His mother was a native of New York, and a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, into which communion her husband also came, during the infancy of their children. No event of his childhood and youth was of a character to require our special notice. He attended the grammar-school of Columbia College, and afterward pursued the undergraduate course at that institution; but on account of his father's desire that his education should be more immediately practical, he left college without a degree and went to London, where he became a student of botany and horticulture at the Royal Gardens. He afterward returned to New York, and at a later date was employed as a clerk in the Methodist Book Room.

Of the beginning of his religious life, and his entrance upon the work of the ministry, he has left this record:

I was in the employ of Waugh & Mason, Book Agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church, when I was converted at a protracted meeting in Allen-street. This occurred on the 13th of February, 1831. . . . After my conversion I devoted most of my leisure time to reading on religious subjects. I had an impression on my mind from my childhood that I should be a preacher. While thus employed I engaged as a teacher in an African Sunday-school in Elizabeth-street near Bleecker, and was appointed a class-leader in what was called Bowery Village Church—now Seventh-street. It was my custom, after having been elected superintendent of the school, to give the scholars, most of whom were adults and professors of religion, an address on some religious subject, and thus I acquired a habit of speaking publicly on religious subjects.

On the evening of Sunday, 17th of February, 1833, I preached in that house to a very crowded congregation, it having been previously announced that Mr. Floy, the superintendent of the school, would preach. I had no license or authority at that time. . . . My text on that occasion was Exodus xiv, 15, and I had great liberty. If I remember rightly most of the teachers were there, and my father and brother Michael in the back part of the house, completely out of my sight. A few weeks after this I tried again in the old Church in Forsyth-street, by request of

Rev. D. Ostrander, then in charge. I had a most lamentable time, and felt most exceedingly mortified at what I deemed an utter failure. I resolved never to try again, gathering assuredly that God had not called me to the ministry. My impressions seemed to deepen, however, that I ought to preach, and after going through the degrees of exhorter and local preacher, and filling as I could appointments at the Alms-house, Bridewell, Penitentiary, House of Refuge, etc., I was received on trial by the New York Conference in May, 1835, and was appointed to Riverhead, a little station on the eastern end of Long Island.

Of this initial period of his ministry he writes:

My labors here were heavy, having but a small stock of sermons when I commenced, and being obliged to preach to the same congregation two, and often three, sermons on the Sabbath. There was very little visible fruit of my efforts.

My second year I spent on the Hempstead Circuit, with J. Law in charge. It was a very prosperous year, and a great many were converted. My third year, having been ordained deacon, I was appointed to the Harlem Mission with D. De Vinne in charge. . . . This year, in company with P. R. Brown and C. K. True, I went to the antislavery convention at Utica. Some account of the consequences to me resulting from this step may be seen in my Scrap-book.

At the time Mr. Floy entered the Methodist ministry the subject of abolitionism was in its early stages of violent agitation. The American Antislavery Society had been organized a short time before, and its conflict with the then all-prevalent conservatism, in both Church and State, was already begun. The New York Conference, then led by men whose names have passed into the history of the Church among those of its great lights, was strong, not to say violent, in its opposition to the new movement. The subject was discussed in a style and temper rather unedifying, both publicly and privately, by word and through the press. In Methodist circles the feeling and expression was nearly all on one side, and a Methodist abolitionist was looked upon as a monstrosity not to be tolerated. Previous to the General Conference of 1836 no case had occurred of disciplinary proceedings against any member of that conference for abolition opinions or practices. It was perhaps deemed inexpedient to do so in the absence of any law or precedent upon which such proceedings could be based. But the General Conference of 1836 supplied this deficiency. In its pastoral address, after earnestly deprecating the evil

influences of "abolitionism," it added this injunction, advice, or expression of opinion:

> From every view of the subject which we have been able to take, and from the most calm and dispassionate view of the whole ground, we have come to the solemn conviction that the only safe, scriptural, and prudent way for us, both as ministers and people, to take, is wholly to refrain from this agitating subject, which is now convulsing the country, and consequently the Church, from end to end, by calling forth inflammatory speeches, papers and pamphlets.

The New York Conference of 1836 met soon after the rising of the General Conference, and on the first day of the session a committee of five was appointed to "strike out a course proper to be pursued by the members of this conference on the subject of abolition." The committee* reported next day three resolutions—the first declaring "that this conference fully concur in the advice of the late General Conference as expressed in their pastoral address," relative to abolition. The second "disapproved of the members of this conference patronizing, or in any way giving countenance to a paper called 'Zion's Watchman.'" The third says: "That although we could not condemn any man, or withhold our suffrages from him on account of his *opinions* merely in reference to the subject of abolitionism, yet we are decidedly of the opinion that none ought to be elected to the office of a deacon or elder in our Church unless he will give a pledge to the conference that he will refrain from agitating the Church with discussions on this subject."

This action was taken by the Conference not in relation to any case or cases that had come before it, but by way of defining its position, and giving notice in advance of what would be its action in the event of such "agitating discussions" by any of its members. It must be observed in passing that nowhere is the sense and scope of the word "abolition" defined, but it is well known to have included any and all opposition to slavery, whether economical, political, or moral. The inhibited "agitating discussions" are known to have included only those *against* slavery, for the same men who so strenuously opposed "agitations" were vehement in their denunciations, both public and private, of abolition and aboli-

* D. Ostrander, N. Bangs, P. P. Sandford, L. Pease, and J. C. Green.

tionists. It does not appear that the minority made any opposition at that conference.

Of the action of the conference for 1837 we find this minute: "James Floy admitted and ordained to deacon's orders;" and as this was done the first year after the foregoing action, it may be presumed that he accepted ordination under the required "pledge," either explicitly or implicitly given; and as it is known that the test was sometimes formally applied, there is good reason to believe that it was so in this case.

At this session the conference resolved, "That in view of the sentiments expressed by the General Conference on the subject of abolitionism, as well as from a conviction of duty, it is inexpedient for the members of this conference to indulge in public discussions of this agitating subject, and that therefore we pledge ourselves to refrain from all such discussions. That we still adhere to the resolution adopted by this conference last year in respect to patronizing 'Zion's Watchman.'" At this session, also, Charles K. True was called to account and rather severely treated for "certain communications in 'Zion's Watchman,' and for reading an address on the subject of abolition to his congregation at Middletown, Conn."

The New York Conference for 1838 met in Greene-street Methodist Episcopal Church. In the Journal, under the question, "Who are the Deacons?" we find the following: "James Floy. His presiding elder stated that it was reported that Brother Floy had been guilty of contumacy and insubordination in contravening the known and published will of this and the General Conference in forwarding and abetting the doings of an unauthorized convention of Methodists and Methodist ministers." His case was referred to a committee of seven.*

In due time the committee on the case of J. Floy reported, but the character of the report we know only by common fame, and by inferences from the recorded action of the conference. The report is referred to in the Journal

* P. P. Sandford, S. Merwin, E. Woolsey, A. Hunt, E. Washburn, J. B. Stratton, C. Green. During the conference similar complaints were made against several others, namely: J. M. Pease, C. K. True, P. R. Brown, D. De Vinne, D. Plumb, H. Hosted, and J. F. Huber; the last a local preacher, candidate for ordination. All of them (except D. De Vinne, who was allowed to pass without trial, as no overt act was alleged against him) were referred to the same committee, and acted on by them.

in the usual form: "See document I;" but unluckily (or perhaps luckily) the entire bundle of conference documents for that year has mysteriously disappeared from the archives. Its purport appears to have been an indictment for "contumacy and insubordination," in attending a certain abolition convention at Utica, New York, with a recommendation that therefore he be suspended from the office of a deacon during the pleasure of the conference. Mr. Floy objected to the finding of the committee, and demanded to be heard by the Conference. The Journal proceeds: "The chairman of the committee, Rev. P. P. Sandford, proceeded to present the case. He produced various documents setting forth the character of the several antislavery conventions which originated the convention at Utica, a participation in the doings of which furnishes the ground of charge against Brother Floy; also the doings of the said convention at Utica as published in 'Zion's Watchman,' and the character of the paper selected by said convention for the publication of its doings;" and at the end of this extract adds, "See minutes taken by the secretary [of the committee probably] and on file, marked document K;" but "document K" is not "on file." The Journal adds further: "The chairman then stated that the convention, in view of its origin; in having adopted 'Zion's Watchman' as its official organ; in having assumed to itself the right of managing the affairs of the Methodist Episcopal Church in relation to slavery; in appointing delegates to the British Canada Conference of Wesleyan Methodists to represent the position the Methodist Episcopal Church sustained to slavery; and in making provision for the call of another convention, had proved itself, in the estimation of the committee, schismatic and revolutionary in its character, and involved those itinerant ministers who had participated in its doings in the guilt of contumacy and insubordination, and that Brother Floy had thus participated. The prosecution here rested."

The defense was conducted by the accused in person. Of the substance of his defense the Journal gives no account. From other sources we learn that it occupied about three hours, and was conceded on all hands to be able. Its tone was calm and conciliatory, and with evident purpose to avert the threatened penalty. It was eminently loyal to the Church

though to the last faithful to the cause of antislavery. The picture of himself as he was about to go out from the conference shorn of his ministerial character, a disgraced man and minister, before the Church and the world, was at once pathetic and noble, and drew tears from the eyes of those who were already predetermined to accomplish the deprecated work.

The conference now proceeded to its final action in the case. It was moved and seconded that the conference concur in the decision of the committee to the guilt of James Floy; and the question was carried by a rising vote, one hundred and twenty-four against seventeen.* The question on the adoption of the resolution in the report [of the committee] was then put and carried by a rising vote of one hundred and two against thirty-one. That resolution was in these words:

Resolved, That James Floy, being guilty of contumacy and insubordination, be suspended from the exercise of the peculiar functions of a deacon in the Church of God until he shall give satisfaction to the conference.

This action of the conference was complete in itself, and by it the accused was suspended from his ordination as deacon. After this he asked and obtained leave "to make such extracts from the Journals in reference to his case as he desired," and on the Journals a little further along we find the following:

A communication from Brother Floy was received as follows: "Without making any remarks upon the proceedings of this conference in my case, I pledge myself honorably to abide by and faithfully to carry out, so far as in me lies, the resolutions and requirements of this conference so long as I continue a member thereof." Carried by a rising vote of one hundred and twenty-seven to one.

What it was that was "carried" we can only infer from the connection; probably a motion to accept the pledge as satisfactory, and removing the suspension. Just as the conference was about to adjourn,

It was, on motion, resolved, That in the judgment of this conference it is incompatible with the duty which its members owe to the Church as its ministers for them to be engaged in attending antislavery conventions, delivering abolition lectures, or forming

* We have been at some pains to ascertain the names of these seventeen, with only partial success. Among them were D. De Vinne, C. K. True, S. Landon, P. K. Brown, H. Husted, C. Foss, D. Plumb, C. W. Turner, E. E. Griswold. Probably among them were J. M. Pease, H. Humphreys, T. Bainbridge, and H. Brown.

antislavery societies in or out of the Church, or in any way agitating the subject so as to disturb the peace and harmony of the Church, and that they be, and hereby are, affectionately advised and admonished to refrain from all these things.

With this action closed the memorable session of the New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Greene-street Church, May, 1838. Its members went out to their several places, each with his own reflections, and all bearing with them thoughts and impressions that were to produce their results in after times. Mr. Floy was returned for a second year to the Harlem Mission.

The reflections raised by this narration of facts are painful and perplexing. The men that appear upon the stage are the same that every loyal Methodist of the last half century has learned to love and reverence. Could we separate their acts from the actors, and estimate them only as they seem to deserve, we should write hard things respecting them. But this cannot be done. The perpetrators of these things, which seem to us so iniquitous, were great and good men — men of clear intellects and warm hearts, who had made, and were constantly making, large sacrifices and performing great labors for the cause of religion. They were our fathers in the Gospel, and our exemplars in the Methodist ministry. Still their conduct in these cases cannot be excused, but only palliated. Were these only private and personal affairs we would make haste to imitate the conduct of the sons of Noah, and hide our fathers' shame with the covering of oblivion. But these things were not done in a corner. They were public acts, and parts of a great drama acted before the world, and therefore amenable to the public judgment. The revenges of time, so slow and yet so sure, are already overtaking them. "Blindness had indeed in part happened to Israel;" but let the present take warning from the past, lest we be as unjust in our criticisms as they were in their determinations.

Individual actions and characters cannot be justly estimated independent of their times and circumstances, and so to judge rightly of the acts of those men, their times, and the state of things about them, must be considered. The history of American public sentiment respecting slavery is full of painful instruction. The old antislaveryism of the revolutionary

period began sensibly to decline during the second decade of our century. The first step forward of pro-slaveryism politically was the passage of the Missouri Compromise in 1820. But before that time, and as an occasion making that act possible, there had been a manifest abatement of antislavery utterances in political discussions by the Church and in literature. The same tendencies continued with accelerated force during the next ten years, and in 1830 the prevailing public sentiment of the people of this country was only theoretically against slavery, but earnestly against any decided practical action in opposition to that system. The institution had become a large element of public wealth, which uniformly asks to be let alone. It had also grown into a political power, and therefore commanded public respect and consideration. In the slave states it had grown into the soul and substance of the Churches, and the Christianity of those states had lifted its ban from the peculiar institution. And as the great religious denominations were national in their organization, the pro-slaveryism of southern Christianity might not be inconsiderately condemned at the North. This influence was powerfully effective upon the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was especially strong in the South, both in the number of its adherents and in their having wealth and social position. With a pardonable denominational pride, the Methodists of the free states, made up as they were from the poor and middle classes, remembered that in the South their denomination embraced a large portion of the wealthy and learned. A tenderness toward slavery, and an indisposition to denounce it, or in any way to meddle with it, stealthily, but rather rapidly, came to be the prevailing sentiment of the ruling minds in the Church. The bishops and other leading ministers from the North had traveled southward, and enjoyed the hospitality of their southern brethren, with which they were very generally entirely captivated. It thus had become a case of denominational policy to avoid all earnest actions or expressions against slavery, and, as far as might be, to apologize for the practice of slaveholding by Church members.

Such was the course things were taking in the nation generally, and more particularly in the Methodist Episcopal Church, when the word *abolition* began to be spoken again after its disuse for a quarter of a century. The stream of public feel-

ing had long flowed smoothly and rapidly in favor of slavery, and this was as a great rock thrown into the current. Of course agitations ensued; it could not be otherwise. The merchants knew that it was by this craft they had their wealth, and they most certainly would oppose all attempts to interfere with their gains. Northern politicians could not afford to lose their southern allies, and so both political parties were bound to satisfy the demands of their southern associates respecting their own specialty. The great ecclesiastical bodies, vitally present both in the South and the North, and sensitively alive not only to feel all overt actions, but also any opinions anywhere expressed against slavery, were thrilled with horror at the idea of attacking slavery as sinful, and putting it under the ban of religion. This new, or rather renewed, manifesto against slavery was accordingly responded to by a fierce and earnest protest from all these parties, and the aspect of things promised no easy conquest to the new crusaders. It is generally believed that these original abolitionists were not themselves the most discreet of men; that they rushed headlong into the conflict, and needlessly irritated when they should have conciliated; that, indeed, they were rather reckless revolutionists than sober reformers. It would be very natural to presume that this was so, as such has often been the case in similar circumstances. But the direct evidence that such were the facts is not altogether satisfactory, though their story has been told us by their opponents.

At that time the denominational unity of Methodism was much more intimate than it has since become, and of that unity New York city was then, much more than now, the heart and center. New York Methodism was then at least metropolitan, not to say imperial. It controlled the denominational press, which it has long since ceased to do, and to a very large degree it directed the opinions and doings of the denomination. The New York Conference at that time contained a very large share of men whose names have become historical in the annals of American Methodism. But, as is often the case, this dictator of public opinion was itself very largely subject to outside influences, and was least of all independent in its decisions and preferences. Left to their individual determinations, very probably nearly every one of those leading men would have

condemned slavery as decidedly, if not as fiercely, as did any one of their abolition opponents. But their position did not allow them to act out their own individual convictions and feelings. They concluded that great denominational interests were involved in the issue which they were bound to protect; that abstract right was not the rule to be pursued, but what seemed best in view of all the circumstances. If in this they erred, they had very many and very great precedents for what they did. That principle, which has ruled so largely amid human councils, was succinctly announced by a Jewish high priest on a most memorable occasion, when, waiving the question of the guilt or innocence of the intended victim, he declared that it was "expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." The question of the abstract right or wrong of slavery must be kept in abeyance that the Church might not be agitated, and, perhaps, torn asunder by its discussion. Better suffer the present evil of slavery, and wait till God shall open some way of escape from it, than to sacrifice the peace and the unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church. So they reasoned, and so they acted. We may mourn over their mistakes, but let us not judge them severely.

That the whole action was wrong is now very manifest; and by all the parties to the sad transactions, probably, it was felt to be so. The whole aspect of the conference during the proceedings is described by an eyewitness as *funereal*. Ministers of hitherto unblemished reputations, and some of them of conspicuous positions, were arraigned and tried before their peers for acts which not even their accusers accounted immoral, and suspended from the ministry for doing what very many believed was nearer right than wrong. Mr. Floy's defense, by its ability, calmness, and yet evident sadness, operated powerfully upon all present, and it became the salient point of his subsequent reputation and influence. His antagonists had achieved a victory; but it was only less disastrous, if at all so, than a defeat. It was certainly the epoch from which the influence of the chief actors in the business steadily and rapidly declined; and not many years afterward the conference acquitted itself of the whole business. Mr. Floy faithfully kept the pledge made to

the conference till that body itself came over to his ground, though all the time he was known and recognized as a confessed abolitionist. But it is quite certain that he wore it as a fetter upon his soul, a badge of his own enslavement, and a memento of a great wrong done to him. The sore it gave him was in time healed, but the scar was always tender, and when touched, in later life, it seldom failed to arouse him to such spirited onslaughts upon the old enemy, as suggested to those who witnessed them the suspicion that there was yet a sore spot where the fetters had chafed him. A sense of wrong and degradation, self-inflicted under unjust pressure, is a gangrene in the soul that will not be cured; and if this was his case he had ample opportunities to abundantly revenge himself—and they were not unimproved.

Of this year's ministry he writes:

> My fourth year was on the same ground, [Harlem Mission,] with John Tackaberry in charge. . . . There was a revival in Rose Hill [Twenty-seventh-street] and in Forty-first-street, and many were added to the Lord. This year I preached several sermons for A. S. Francis in Bedford-street, and at the conference held in May, 1839, I was arraigned for preaching abolition. . . . I stated to the conference that I had the sermon referred to in my pocket, and would read it if requested. . . . The conference dropped the matter without much discussion.

The sermon, which is among his papers, is a plain and earnest exposition and application of John viii, 36, and very clearly evinces his intense hatred of slavery, and also, by its reserves, his carefulness to avoid further complications with the conference. The fact that it was made the occasion of a complaint, shows the morbid sensitiveness of the public mind on that subject.

At this conference Mr. Floy was ordained an elder.

His next appointment was to Kortright Circuit, in Delaware District, as preacher in charge. He immediately repaired to his appointment, made one round of his circuit, and then repaired to New York for his family. But such was the indisposition of his wife, that her physician (Dr. D. M. Reese) forbade her removal. In consequence of this he was released from his appointment, when, being unemployed as a minister, he returned to his old employment at the Book Room. A vacancy having occurred at the Washington-street Church in

Brooklyn, he filled that pulpit, by agreement of all parties, though unofficially, for the balance of the year. At the ensuing conference his character was passed without opposition, and he was formally appointed to Washington-street Church, Brooklyn, where he continued till the conference for 1842. At the close of these two years he thankfully recorded his gratitude to God for the success that had been granted him in his ministry at that Church. The names of some of those received by him into Church fellowship are also given; and when, six years later, the writer of these pages came into the same appointment, many of them were among the able and excellent of the Church. The name of their former pastor was always mentioned by the people of that Church with both reverence and affection.

At the conference of 1842 Mr. Floy acted as assistant secretary. A few years later he became the secretary of the conference, and either in that office or as assistant, he kept the conference Journals for fourteen years. It is neither exaggeration nor injustice to say that those Journals are models of such records, and of a degree of excellence seldom equaled. From this conference he was appointed to Danbury, Conn., where he continued two years. At the close of the first year he wrote:

> In reviewing the year past I find much cause for thankfulness. We held a protracted meeting in the fall, at which a number were converted; but the work was not so general nor extensive as I hoped it would be. In the winter a young man, Chittenden by name, visited the place, and obtained permission to occupy the Church for the purpose of lecturing on the subject of the second advent, Millerism, as it is called. Immense crowds flocked to hear him. I know none who imbibed his peculiarity on that subject, or who were converted through his instrumentality; but the minds of the people seemed awake to religious subjects, and we held immediately after he left another protracted meeting which resulted more favorably than the former. . . . Our net increase during the year is about eighty, most of the additions being young men.

The two years of Mr. Floy's service at Danbury constituted the transition period in the history of Methodism in that place. A few years later, during the pastoral term of Rev. W. C. Hoyt, a new and commodious house of worship was erected, and from that time Danbury has been reckoned among the first-class appointments in the conference.

The session of the New York Conference for 1844 was held at Sands-street Church, Brooklyn. Bishop Hedding presided, and Mr. Floy was then first made chief secretary. This session took place immediately after the close of the General Conference which had passed the famous "Plan of Separation," which now came up at this conference for approval. Mr. Floy was among the small minority that opposed it. As usual, he was before his times; but not very far ahead just then, for only three years later his conference elected him a delegate to the General Conference on that very issue. At the close of that conference he was sent to Madison-street Church, New York city, where he remained two years. His services at that Church were very highly appreciated; they were also highly successful in consolidating a new congregation, and to a moderate extent in the conversion of souls. Many marked indications of the high estimation in which he was held were given him.

The conference for 1846 met at Seventh-street Church, New York. Of it he wrote:

> Annual conference commenced on the 13th of May. *It was memorable for the defeat of the Old Hunkers.* I am astonished at the love shown me by my people at Madison-street, and the sincere regret with which we part.

His next appointment was to Middletown, Conn., to which he seems to have gone without any high expectations. At the conference of 1847, held in Allen-street Church, New York, the delegates to the General Conference to be held in Pittsburgh in May, 1848, were chosen. The Church was at that time much agitated respecting the course to be pursued relative to the division of the Church, as provided for by the former General Conference, and afterward carried out by the secession of the Southern conferences. The "Christian Advocate," under the conduct of Dr. Bond, had taken strong ground against the division, and demanded the abrogation of the Plan of Separation. On this issue the election of delegates was made, by which some of the prescriptive leaders of the body were left out, and a number of new men chosen. Of these was Mr. Floy, who was elected on the first ballot by a decided majority. He attended the General Conference of 1848, of which he was a diligent and effective, rather than a showy member. From his own memoranda we extract these two sentences:

On my motion a committee was appointed to consider the propriety of revising the hymn book, the report of which committee was written by me, and I am appointed one of the seven to whom this duty is assigned. As a member and secretary of the Committee on the Book Concern I was very much confined during the session of the conference.

The "Book Committee," that important feature in the government of our publishing interests, was reconstructed at this General Conference, and put in the form in which it now stands, on motion of Mr. Floy, who, however, had received the first suggestions of it from a fellow-delegate.

From the New York Conference of 1848 Mr. Floy was sent to the First Methodist Episcopal Church at New Haven. The conference having been divided by the late General Conference, the separation to take place at the close of this session of the New York Conference, he became a member of the New York East Conference. At the commencement of the Wesleyan University for that year he received, without solicitation, the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity. Respecting his two years at New Haven, he remarks in his diary:

Much of my time during the year past [the former of the two] has been devoted to the preparation of a new hymn book for our Church. Myself and R. A. West were the sub-committee to whom the work was referred. The far greater part I did myself. Nearly all the additions were selected by me. It has passed the examination of the editors, Book Committee, and bishops, and is now printing under my supervision. On this business I made many visits to New York and one to Baltimore.

The conference for this year (1850) met at First Church, New Haven. The last year has been one of great sickness and death. My wife has been confined mostly to her bed, and with difficulty is removed to our new home, 83 Madison-street, New York, to which charge I am reappointed. There is very little cause of rejoicing at the success of Methodism in this City of Elms during the past year. Our congregations on the Sabbath have been large and attentive. Prayer-meetings and class-meeting too much neglected, and few if any conversions. The fault is in me I doubt not. I am ashamed of myself. Have mercy upon me, O God!

At the close of his second term of two years at the Madison-street Church he writes: "There have been some twenty-five or thirty conversions during the year, (and about as many last year,) and the Church is in a good state."

The following entry is also found under date of November

2, 1850, but evidently written some weeks later. It is a reminiscence of an affair that caused some little agitation at the time, and most painfully exhibited the abject subjection of a portion of the Methodists of New York to the Moloch of slavery.

At the preachers' meeting this morning W. C. Hoyt read an Essay on Slavery. G. Brown offered a resolution to send it to the Richmond Christian Advocate for publication. Motion to amend by striking out the word "Richmond." As a substitute I offered a resolution expressing abhorrence of the requirements of the Fugitive Slave Bill, passed at the last session of Congress. Discussed till we adjourned. Next Saturday (9th) a preamble and resolution were offered (by D. W. Clark) and adopted without a dissenting voice. They found their way into the columns of the Evening Post, and have made quite a buzz. Allen-street has had a meeting of lay members, adopting resolutions in opposition. The First Church in Williamsburgh followed; the First Church in New Haven; Mulberry-street, New York; Vestry-street, Forsyth-street, on the 22d December, (present twenty-seven persons, of whom nine voted against;) John-street; but here the ball was stopped, a majority present voting against the resolutions presented.

At the election of delegates to the General Conference of 1852 Dr. Floy failed to be chosen, lacking, however, only a few votes of a majority. The strong pro-slavery reaction of the period so largely affected the conference that so decided an abolitionist could not command their suffrages. It was, however, only a transient withdrawal of confidence, which was very soon returned with increased earnestness of devotion. From the conference of 1852 he was sent to the Twenty-Seventh-street Church, New York, where he continued two years, laboring diligently and with a good degree of success. Of all the ministers who have had the privilege of serving that excellent Church and congregation, none are remembered more gratefully or named more reverently than Dr. Floy.

In 1854 he was appointed presiding elder of New York District, New York East Conference, which office he filled for two years. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1856, held at Indianapolis. Of the proceedings of this body his diary contains no record. By that body he was elected Editor of the National Magazine, and Corresponding Secretary of the Tract Society, in which office he was occupied during the ensuing four years. In 1860 he was a delegate to the Gen-

eral Conference at Buffalo, and aided in placing the Discipline of the Church upon the broad antislavery basis that it now has. At its close he returned to the regular pastoral work, and while without an appointment between the session of the General Conference of 1860 and the New York East Conference of 1861, he occupied his time in preparing a series of Sunday-school Question Books. In 1861 he was appointed to Seventh-street, New York, and in 1863 to Beekman Hill, (Fiftieth-street,) New York. Here, on the 14th day of October, 1863, in his ~~fifty-eighth~~ year, he ceased at once ~~to~~ work and live.

From this sketch of the itinerant life of Dr. Floy, which it was thought best to present in a continuous narrative, we now pass to more general remarks and reflections. We have first to notice the influences under which he devoted himself to the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church. To such a one as he was at that time the world presented strong inducements and large promises of success in either professional or business life. Or if the ministry was to be chosen other denominations, and especially that one which was properly his hereditary Church, the Episcopalian, offered much greater worldly inducements. His own account of the case, however, shows that in choosing the ministerial calling, and that too in the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was actuated by a controlling conscientiousness. He became a Methodist itinerant minister because he believed God called him to that work, and he dared not "reason with flesh and blood," and, therefore, he "was not disobedient to the heavenly vision." This fidelity to his convictions was characteristic of the man, and it became in his after life the occasion of both his troubles and his successes. It also distinguished his religious character and life, the former of which was eminently free from hypocrisy, and the latter from cant. His religion was much more matter of conviction than of sentiment, and though often deeply emotional, yet he habitually suppressed and concealed his religious feelings, while he steadily pursued the way of duty. That he carried this excellence too far may be suspected; and his manner in that thing, though it commands our admiration, cannot be commended as best. The tendencies of the times are doubtless to too much reserve in religious profession; and Dr. Floy both yielded to

that influence himself, and by his example gave it more authority.

Next to his rigid conscientiousness, the peculiar form of his intellect gave fashion to his mind and course of life. The natural characteristics of his intellect were manliness, vigor, and activity. He confronted the truth bravely, and grappled with it vigorously, and from the intuitive unrest of the soul within him he was impelled forward in intellectual activities. Incidental advantages came in to second and forward these natural tendencies. Both his home education and his early school discipline concurred with the native cast of his mind, and intensified its original impulses. His grammar-school training, under the immediate tuition of Prof. Anthon, who was then earning the reputation which now places his name so conspicuously forward among the classical scholars of the age, may be considered the one great fact that fixed his mental status, and so determined his intellectual character. That gave him the peculiar culture that ever distinguished all the productions of his mind. Though a man of extensive knowledge, he was educated rather than learned—more distinguished for a scholarly culture than for a cyclopedian range of information. Hence he became by necessity a critic. The whole domain of the æsthetic was his playground, in which his tastes, whether discriminative or appreciative, found full room for action. The meretricious, the tawdry, the incongruous, were detected with the clearness of sunlight, and condemned with a corresponding decisiveness; while those excellencies which only a cultivated taste can recognize were as surely seen and duly appreciated. Of all our faculties, taste is perhaps the most peremptory and exacting. It never stops to argue, and admits of no questioning of its decisions. Its approvals are quiet, and often little more than silent acceptances; while its condemnations, though equally quiet, are often terribly withering because of that very self-possession. The practice of criticism is often bitterly denounced by those who dread its searching power, but in literature especially it is of inestimable value. It is a noble profession—a liberal and liberalizing art.

With a mind so constituted and furnished, Dr. Floy became a writer by a kind of necessity. There were thoughts in his mind that sought for utterance, and he possessed in a large

degree the powers needful for their expression; while the Methodist denominational press, then rising into a power in the Church and the world, offered opportunities for their promulgation. Those facts no doubt determined his position as a literary man. He was a writer for the periodical press rather than an author of books.

As a writer, Dr. Floy is best known by his contributions to the pages of this Review, extending over a period of nearly a quarter of a century. In the number for April, 1838—a date just before his arraignment and suspension from the diaconate by the New York Conference for being present at an antislavery meeting—is found an essay from his pen, entitled "The Judgment Register," which, though his first effort in so wide a field, demonstrates his mastery of the art of essay writing at that period. It has indeed all the peculiarities for which he afterward became renowned—a thorough mastery of his theme, clearness and comprehensiveness of views, and the facility of utterance, in pure, simple, and not inelegant English, which induced a competent judge in such matters to declare that he never wrote a sentence of bad English in his lifetime. A few years later, when the Quarterly, under the editorship of Dr. Peck, had assumed an advanced position among the first of its class, a review of Dr. Porter's "Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching"—which was, however, rather an elaborate essay on that subject—appeared in its pages, and attracted much attention. It appeared anonymously, and, of course, was judged of without favor or prejudice from its authorship, and he had the satisfaction of having it warmly commended by those whose approval he most valued, and also some who might have been more chary of their praises had its authorship been known.

From that time Dr. Floy's articles became a distinguishing feature of the Methodist Quarterly, and they, quite as largely as those of any other writer, contributed to the standing to which it has attained. Their subjects are various; and while each is marked by its own individuality, they all bear unmistakable marks of their common origin.

As an essayist and reviewer, Dr. Floy was always conscientious and faithful to his own convictions of right. On doctrinal points he uniformly maintained his own opinions, which were highly orthodox and evangelical, in opposition to the evi-

dent tendencies of the great mass of the educated minds of the age. His convictions as to human rights and the sin and wrong of oppression, not only cropped out occasionally in his writings, but were prominently brought out with all clearness and energy of utterance. And yet he delighted in the beautiful—the quiet pleasures of a cultivated taste—and some of his best pieces are chiefly exercises in literary æsthetics.

Probably no other department of Church-work was more highly valued by Dr. Floy than that of the department of Sabbath-schools. His career as a religious instructor began in the Sabbath-school, and the last labor he performed—on the day of his decease—was to add a chapter to a Sabbath-school instruction book that he was preparing. Among his literary remains are found lectures, sermons, and addresses in behalf of the cause; and of the few books that bear his name on their title-page, nearly all are for the use of Sabbath-schools. His friends, with good cause, regret that he never devoted himself to authorship, being quite certain that he would not have failed of eminent success, and so would have made the world his perpetual debtor. As an instance of the versatility of his genius, he a few years since, by way of testing his powers, set himself to write a story book for boys, and the result was one of the most popular of the juveniles published at the Methodist Book Room, "Harry Budd." But having satisfied himself of his ability so to write, he made no further efforts in that direction.

Dr. Floy's great literary work, which is indeed his best monument, is the hymn book of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now in use. His attention was early directed to the subject of hymnology, and among the oldest of his literary remains are a variety of slips from newspapers, evidently written by himself, containing notes and queries respecting certain hymns, with criticisms on their composition. In the Methodist Quarterly for April, 1844, appeared a long and elaborate article from his pen on the Methodist Hymn Book, with disquisitions on modern hymnology generally, and Methodist hymns in particular. This led to further discussions of the subject in the Church papers by himself and others, and a very considerable interest was awakened on the subject. It was very generally conceded that the hymn book then in use ought to be thoroughly revised, and its contents enriched from

exterior sources. Still it seemed to be a formidable undertaking to replace by another, however excellent, a manual of devotion not only in the hands, but to a large extent in the hearts also, of more than a million worshipers. The Methodists too, as a people, make much of the hymn book. With them it largely occupies the place of the prayer-book with Episcopalians, and the catechism with Presbyterians. The doctrinal teachings of their hymns are scarcely less authoritative than those of the Bible; their warnings and exhortations are as effective as those of the pulpit; and to a mind capable of appreciating their practical adaptation to Christian culture the high estimate set upon those hymns must be amply justified. Still it was not to be denied that while the old hymn book contained a great amount of excellent devotional poetry, it was defective both in matter and arrangement, and not altogether without inaccuracies and improprieties of language and style. The asked-for revision was therefore very generally conceded as necessary.

At the General Conference of 1848 Dr. Floy called the attention of that body to the subject by asking for a committee to consider the question of the revision of the hymn book. The General Conference favored the motion, and the mover was placed on the committee, and afterward also on the committee appointed to do the designated work.* His associates were from among the ablest and most cultivated, whether of the ministry or laity, of the Church. On account of the residence

* The committee were Rev. D. Daily, of Philadelphia; Rev. J. B. Alverson, of Rochester; Rev. D. Patten, of Providence; Rev. F. Merrick, of Ohio; Rev. J. Floy, of New York; Mr. D. Creamer, of Baltimore; and Mr. R. A. West, of Brooklyn. The first two of these, though not classically educated, were both of them men of taste and culture, who had devoted much attention to sacred poetry. Of the former Dr. Floy wrote: "He was a faithful member of the committee—suggested several alterations which were adopted, and wrote verses which are among my choice." Of the latter: "He took much interest in the work." Messrs. Patten and Merrick were both classical scholars, and by their tastes and reading especially adapted to the work. Mr. Creamer had made Methodist Hymnology the study of his lifetime, and he has probably the most nearly complete collection of Methodist poetry in existence, of the spirit of which he has himself drunk deeply. Mr. West is the son of an honored Wesleyan minister, and brother to an ex-president of the British Conference, and a foster-son of Kingswood School. In addition to these accidental advantages, he possessed a fine poetical taste and a large acquaintance with the later poetry of Methodism. Two of the hymns in the new hymn book are from his pen.

of the committee in distant and diverse places, it was found necessary to devolve the work chiefly upon the two residing at and near New York, Messrs. Floy and West. And as Mr. West was very fully occupied with other duties, the work was actually performed by Dr. Floy, not, however, without valuable assistance from his associates.

The duty assigned to the committee by the General Conference was to *revise* the old hymn book, but they proceeded in fact to make a new one. The plan of arrangement was entirely recast, and the matter of the old book thrown into the common stock of available material. The whole range of sacred poetry in the language was laid under contribution, and whatever was deemed of sufficient excellence and adapted to the design was freely used. And yet the new book is, scarcely less than its predecessor, of Wesleyan paternity. Of its eleven hundred and forty-eight hymns, more than half (six hundred and four) are by the Wesleys. Watts, the next largest contributor, has seventy-two, many of which have been largely Wesleyanized. Montgomery gives fifty-seven; Steele thirty; Doddridge twenty-three; Newton fourteen; Cowper thirteen; and Heber and Hart each ten. One hundred and twenty-six others contribute each from nine to one; and thirty hymns are of unascertained authorship.*

To make a hymn book is something more than the selection and arrangement of a given amount of sacred poetry in a volume. A hymn book editor may be less than a poet in metrical compositions; but he must also be something more than a poet. His range for action is necessarily a cramped and narrow one. His pieces must be short—four lines will suffice as a minimum, and eight times that number should be accounted the maximum, and that seldom to be reached. Each hymn must be at once a unit and complete in itself. The language of these sacred songs should be always plain and easily understood, yet pure, chaste, and somewhat elevated. Their doctrinal statements should be direct, but never polemical, avoiding all intricacies and obscurities; they must nevertheless discriminate accurately, and everywhere preserve the "analogy of faith."

* In the list of authors of hymns given in the table of contents we have detected but one mistake. Hymn 751 is credited to *Walter* Scott. It was written before he was born by *John* Scott, the Quaker poet of Amwell, England. Other annotators have fallen into the same error.

A hymn is more than a sacred lyric; it is a form of worship; the expression not of some special and unusual exercise of the soul, but the common aspirations of the great congregation. Its religious tone should be higher than the ordinary level of Christian experience, that those using it may be elevated by it, yet not so far removed as to fail of proper sympathy with the hearts of the worshipers. To adjust all these things requires rare qualifications of both heart and mind; only an experienced Christian and a ripe scholar, in a single individual, should engage in such a work. It is evident that in this case the work produced, both in its excellencies and its defects, bears the impress alike of the mind and the heart of its chief compiler.

In this work Dr. Floy's critical acumen was largely called into exercise. Many of the most celebrated sacred poets have not been remarkable for the accuracy of their language nor the faultlessness of their prosody, and the compilers of hymn books have universally claimed the right to correct and improve their compositions. Of this practice John Wesley was an eminent example as to both the freedom and the excellence of his emendations; but he strongly protested against any such liberty being taken with his own or his brother's hymns. But the protest has been little heeded; sometimes for the worse, often for the better. He himself very freely corrected his brother's poetry, not only in its form but also in its substance, seeking to free it of the mysticisms with which the writer impregnated much of it, and especially to expunge from it certain exceptional doctrinal notions into which his brother at one time fell. Our compilers have carried this work still further, and some otherwise valuable hymns have been wholly omitted on that account. The productions of others were treated with like freedom, and as the result, not only is the Church enriched in her hymnology, but many bardlings, dead or living, have been brought into debt to their critical emendators. And yet there may be great danger that a severe but unpoetical taste will sacrifice genuine inspiration at the demands of grammatical and rhetorical correctness. Probably at this point, more than at any other, Dr. Floy lacked adaptation to his work. He was not a poet, in the fullest sense of that word; and though not destitute of poetical susceptibility, yet his tastes

led him in another direction. He demanded purity and correctness, and often, no doubt, he was tempted to dash the flower because of the imperfection of the vase that contained it. Hence came the exclusion of some really good hymns, excepting only certain infelicities of verbiage; while others were emendated in their rhetoric at the expense of their poetry. And as the result, we have among our hymns a number of rhetorically faultless, but poetically lifeless so-called hymns.

Of the amount of learned labor expended upon that work, but faint notions are entertained by ordinarily intelligent persons who use it. Every piece was examined singly, and its various versions, as found in some twenty standard hymn books collated, and every stanza and line subjected to a critical adjudication, and whenever possible the original, as written by its author, was consulted. Poems of more than the allowable length were abbreviated, and in many cases rearranged, for the sake of unity and completeness; and sometimes two, three, or even more hymns were taken from a single poem. The plan of distribution was designed to present a system of theoretical and practical theology, while especial reference was had to the demands of public worship, and specifically the wants of Methodist congregations. As compared with other books of its class, that hymn book is distinguished for the purity and perspicuity of its language, the chasteness and congruity of its figures, and the faultlessness of its rhythm and rhyme. Doctrinally it is eminently evangelic, Wesleyan, Methodistical; while its renderings of the holy Scriptures and its scriptural allusions are natural, obvious, and readily intelligible. Under the hand of the revisers some of the most impassioned utterances of Charles Wesley were softened and moderated, the better to adapt them to common use, and some of his peculiar and rather erratic doctrinal notions were quietly hidden by judicious omissions or substitutions. The stores of sacred poetry written during the present century were fully drawn upon, and no inconsiderable share of these hymns are post-Wesleyan as to their composition. The new hymn book was issued during the summer of the year 1849, and in a very short time it came into almost universal use in the churches—a practical tribute to its manifest excellence.

An important feature of Dr. Floy's life and character would

be overlooked should we omit to notice his position and influence as a member of his annual conference. The constitution of those bodies, and the work committed to them, very effectively evoke and employ the gifts and characteristics of their members; and there, more than in any other place, was his power displayed. In the work of examining candidates he was almost unequaled. To the disqualified and pretentious he was a perpetual terror, while latent worth or timid excellence were surely detected, assured, and asserted by him. Nearly the whole of the junior portion of the ministers of the New York East Conference have passed through his hands as an examiner, and it may be confidently affirmed that the standard of learning and the style of thought to which they have as a body attained are in no small degree owed to that cause. But in the open deliberations of the conference was eminently the place of his power. Always in his place, and ever watchful of the proceedings, nothing that was transacted escaped his notice; and though he often voted silently, yet he uniformly had a reason for the vote he gave. As a debater he had few equals. He was not remarkable for much speaking, either as to the frequency or the length of his harangues; but his strength lay in the appositeness of his remarks, and the evidently honest zeal with which he expressed them. Men learned unconsciously to believe in him, and to act according to his directions. A recognized leader in the cause of antislaveryism in the conference, he lived to see the great body of the younger ministers arrange themselves by his side. But he was not so exclusively occupied with that subject as to lose himself in it. He was especially interested in the protection and elevation of the character of the ministry, an active promoter of the cause of denominational education, and of all the great charities and benevolent enterprises of the Church. In all these things the conference felt and acknowledged his power, and gladly accepted his leadership.

Though Dr. Floy's career in the ministry was less protracted than that of most who have earned for themselves a reputation, it was long enough to show that his renown was not derived from qualities that do not endure the tests of time and close examination. For twenty-eight successive years he performed the ministerial labor assigned to him in the order of the

Church, and always with fidelity and a good degree of success. As a preacher he was clear, direct, and earnest; in doctrine eminently evangelical, and in exhortation pungent and effective. Yet on account of the elevation of his thoughts, and the rigid correctness of his tastes, which led him to avoid all showy ornamentation or attempts at pompous eloquence, he was a preacher for the appreciative few rather than for the promiscuous multitude. But by those he was very highly valued. During the two years of his pastorate at Middletown, Dr. Olin was one of his constant hearers; and he afterward declared that of all the preachers he had ever known, he would choose Dr. Floy for a pastor for himself and his family—a judgment in which not a few can heartily concur. His death, so sudden and unexpected, brought sadness and sorrow to many who only then were made to realize how much he was endeared to them. But the circumstances of his demise were not comfortless. Quietly in his own house, and in the arms of a loved and dutiful son, without lingering sickness, emaciation, or senility —for "his eye was not dim, nor his natural strength abated" —he rendered up his spirit in the faith and hope in which he had lived. A life-course not entirely without its foibles and defects, yet as free from them as often falls to the lot of erring mortals, was accomplished; a character not faultless, but elevated far above the common walks of life, had been formed and exercised; and now, in the early postmeridian of such a life, it ceased on earth to recommence in heaven. Saved by grace!

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Church Congresses.—Certain active and far-seeing churchmen of the High-Church party have succeeded in introducing into the Church of England a new kind of religious assemblies which bid fair to become of considerable influence in the future of the English Church. They are free gatherings, or, as they are called by the originators, "congresses" of ministers and laymen, for the purpose of giving full expression to their opinions on matters appertaining to the development of the resources of their community, and of discussing the best means for meeting the religious wants of the age. The third of these congresses was held this year at Manchester, the two former ones having taken place at Cambridge and Oxford. While the former ones had comparatively attracted but little attention, the congress of Manchester is

looked upon by the entire press of England as an important event which will secure the annual recurrence of these assemblies, and make a mark in the History of the Church. The originators of the congress had liberally invited co-operation from men of all shades of opinion, including even the editors of thorough dissenting newspapers. Nevertheless, the assembly was in fact composed very largely of the High-Church party, the Evangelicals being seemingly afraid of mixing themselves up with the scheme, though some of them responded to the invitation to be present, and also made speeches and read papers. Though free discussion was invited and no formal vote taken, the congress has generally produced the impression that a strong High-Church current prevails at present in the Established Church, and that all the efforts of the Evangelical School to arrest it will have little effect. The principal subjects discussed by the congress were Church Extension in large towns; Supply and Training of Ministers; Lay Co-operation; Church Architecture; the Management of Large Parishes; Parochial Mission Women; Church Music; the Irish Church; Sunday-schools.

High-Church Tendencies.—The success of the Church congress is only one among numerous proofs that the Church of England is rapidly falling under the exclusive control of the High-Church party. Both in doctrine and organization the Church is now in the process of a transformation which if completed will belong among the most memorable events of the Church history of the nineteenth century. For want of room we can only briefly refer to some of the most important symptoms of the advance of High-Churchism. One of the favorite ideas of the High-Church party, the official recognition of the strongly Romanizing Episcopal Church of Scotland by the Church of England, has recently been carried into effect over the most determined opposition of the evangelical portion of the Church. The former bishop of the Scottish Episcopal Church at Glasgow, Dr. Trower, has been appointed to the See of Gibraltar, without being subjected to a reordination. The Scottish ordination has thus been recognized in England as valid, an important step toward effecting a closer union between the two Churches.

The Episcopal Church of Scotland, in the mean while, is indorsing the movement begun in the English Church for intercommunion with the Oriental Churches, and in particular the Russian. Several diocesan synods have passed resolutions to that end. The same scheme is warmly recommended by a paper published by ecclesiastics of the Russian Church at Paris.

It is a remarkable sign of the times, that the Scottish Episcopal Church, notwithstanding its High-Church and Romanizing character, is finding so many admirers in the (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland, that even a union between the two bodies is thought of and regarded as possible. An unexpectedly large number of young ministers of the Presbyterian Church are said to have declared in favor of this scheme.

Among the other movements of the High-Church party, the attempted restoration of monasticism in the Church of England is attracting special attention. The Bishop of Norwich has commenced proceedings against the rector of Claydon for the facilities he has given to the "monks" to officiate in his Church. But neither the rector nor "Brother Ignatius," the founder of "the Benedictine order of the Church of England," are as yet willing to cease their efforts. Brother Ignatius, in order to awaken a more general interest in his enterprise, has begun to lecture on the re-establishment of monasticism. He defended monastic institutions on scriptural, ecclesiastical, practical, and political grounds, and expected from their restoration in particular the disappearance of pauperism. Brother Ignatius intends to build his first monastery of the order near Claydon, and is now soliciting funds for that purpose. He needs three hundred pounds, and in a recent lecture at Ipswich announced that already forty pounds had been placed at his disposal.

Presbyterian Union.—The joint committees of the Free and United Presbyterian Churches have held several meetings during the past three months, in order to mature the scheme of union between the two Churches, and it is understood that matters hitherto are going on favorably, and that nothing has occurred to cloud the prospect of a satisfactory issue of the negotiation. The question of union was also a prominent topic of discussion at the English Provincial Synod

of the United Presbyterian Church, which has this year been constituted by the General Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, and held its first meeting in Liverpool on the 12th of October and following days. The English Synod declared itself unanimously in favor of it.

GERMANY.

PROTESTANT ASSEMBLIES.—The Gustavus Adolphus Society, whose object is to erect Protestant Churches in the Catholic districts of Germany, and for the Protestant Germans abroad, continues to prosper, and maintains its claim to being the most popular of the religious societies of Germany. It held its annual meeting this year at Lübeck. The Annual Report states that during the year there had been formed forty-eight new branch unions, numbering altogether twelve hundred members. Some provinces, especially those in which high Lutheranism prevailed, showed, however, a want of sympathy. Thus in Pomerania, the most Lutheran of all the German provinces, out of seven hundred parish Church councils that had been addressed, only thirty-six had answered; and in Berlin similar efforts on the part of the president had had very little effect. The publications of the society, its "heralds," "almanacs," and "broadsheets," had been in great demand; the Ladies' Associations had displayed wonderful activity. They had spent during the last financial year 175,038 thalers, which is a marked increase on the preceding year. Special donations had come in to the amount of 6,000 thalers nearly, and fifty-one bequests, amounting to 12,651 thalers, had been received. The society supported during the year four parishes in America, three in Belgium, three hundred and forty-six in Germany, twenty-three in France, eight in Holland, five in Italy, fifty-six in Austria, seventy-two in Hungary, forty-three in Prussian Poland, two in Portugal, two in Russia, six in Switzerland, and eleven in Turkey. Last year there were fifteen churches consecrated, and nineteen more consecrations are contemplated.

The number of periodical assemblies of Protestant Germany has been this year increased by a new one, which held its first meeting at Frankfort-on-the-Main toward the close of September. It calls itself Protestant Diet, (Protestanten Tag,) and its object is to fuse all the Protestant State Churches into one National German Church. Among the theologians who took part in the first assembly were Professor Schenkel and Dr. Zittel, of Heidelberg; Professor Baumgarten, of Rostock; Professor Ewald, of Göttingen. Among the prominent laymen were R. de Bennigsen, the President of the German National Association, Professor Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, and many others. The celebrated historian, Häusser, sent a letter in which he declared for a National Protestant Church, and for the freedom of the individual congregations. In the discussions most of the speakers took the ground that a National Church was desirable, that the liberty of worship restored in its purity by the Reformation was now curtailed by the consistories and their chiefs, the twenty and odd German Sovereigns who arrogate to themselves the supremacy of the Church in their states. They expressed the wish that this liberty were re-established, so as to make the congregations independent in the administration of their religious interests. Several of the speakers referred to the necessity of putting an end to the indifference of the Protestant laymen in religious matters. After a very animated discussion it was resolved to form a "Protestant League," whose object it shall be:

1. To regenerate the German Evangelical Church upon the basis of the independence of the congregations. 2. To guarantee the rights, the honors, the liberty and independence of German Protestantism, and to oppose every hierarchical influence emanating from the Churches of the different countries. 3. To preserve and protect the toleration of the different denominations and their members. 4. To pursue all the enterprises and Christian works tending to promote the moral power of the people. These resolutions were unanimously adopted. An executive committee was appointed to extend the organization throughout all the German states. Among its members are Professor Bluntschli, one of the first jurists of Germany, and professor in the Law Faculty of Heidelberg, (President;) Professor Schenkel, also of Heidelberg (Vice-President;) Professor Ewald, of Göttengin; Professor Baumgarten, formerly of Rostock; Dr. Carl Schwartz, of Gotha; Dr. Sydow, of Berlin; George von Bunsen, member of the Prussian Chamber of Representa-

tives for Bonn, and son of the distinguished scholar and statesman. The executive committee has made all the necessary preparations to establish the organization in every German state.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

GERMANY.

CATHOLIC CONGRESS.—The oldest of Catholic Congresses, that of Germany, held its annual meeting at Frankfort-on-the-Main. The local committee seems to have appreciated the circumstance that the Catholic Assembly was allowed to meet in an almost entirely Protestant city. In a letter written to the Pope to solicit his approbation, they say: "It is certainly a gratifying sign of the sense of justice and the love of peace which prevails among our people, that we should be able, without obstruction, publicly to discuss our Catholic affairs in a city, the immense majority of whose inhabitants do not belong to our confession, and every Christian heart must be filled with joy to see disappearing the divisions and the bitterness so opposed to the knowledge of the truth and the salvation of men." These words show that among the Catholic laity the principle of religious toleration is spreading, although the Pope, even in our times, omits no occasion to denounce it. One object which occupied much attention was the establishment of a Roman Catholic University, which was decided upon in principle in last year's congress, held at Aix-la-Chapelle. A committee appointed for that purpose, having set to work in furtherance of the scheme, gave in a report of its proceedings. It had asked and obtained the requisite permission of the German Episcopate and the Pope. The latter had placed the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne at the head of the undertaking, a circumstance which appears to have singularly fettered the operations of the committee, and even the declarations on the subject at Frankfort; for whenever a proposition was presented, the meeting was itself brought to a stand, and unable to decide anything without the archbishop's consent. The efforts of the committee to collect funds have been attended hitherto with but poor results. Interesting reports were made on the societies for the benefit of the poor and the working classes, which seem to display commendable activity, and to do much good in the great centers of population. In connection with efforts of this class, a most extraordinary man, the monk Theodosius, of Coire, in Switzerland, produced a lively impression upon the assembly by narrating the manner in which he had endeavored to solve the labor question. He has opened in the city of Coire three or four manufacturing establishments, in which all the operatives are brought under monastic rule. One of the most interesting speeches delivered at the congress was that by Professor Jansen, of Frankfort, who took as his subject the proposition "That the Catholic Church has always favored liberty." The speakers, like Count Montalembert at Malines, spoke in favor of religious toleration, and the congress passed resolutions of the same spirit; yet in Frankfort, as well as in Malines, the congresses were careful not to refer to a single Catholic country which still denies to Protestants the enjoyment of equal political rights.

BELGIUM.

CATHOLIC CONGRESS.—The Roman Catholics of Germany and Switzerland have had, since 1848, annual conventions of priests and laymen, to consult on the important interests of their Church. This year Belgium has followed their example, and held its first "Catholic Congress." This Belgian assembly awakened a much more universal interest than its predecessors had done, as it was understood that it would be virtually a congress of both Belgium and France, in the latter of which countries such meetings would not be allowed by the Government to take place, and that it would be moreover largely attended from nearly every country of Europe. The expectation that many of the most celebrated priests and laymen of the Church would be present was realized, for England sent Cardinal Wiseman, and France Montalembert, De Broglie, and Cochin. Cardinal Wiseman made an eloquent speech on the religious and civic position of the Roman Catholics of England; but the great event in the history of the congress was the speech of Count Montalembert on "Freedom of Worship." The distinguished orator spoke in the most eloquent terms against all religious intolerance. Though he did not expressly censure the legisla-

tion of any Catholic country against Protestants, nor the Papal efforts for keeping, by means of concordats, the Protestants excluded from Catholic countries, he did so implicitly by saying: "I must confess that that enthusiastic devotion for religious freedom, by which I am animated, is not everywhere to be found among Catholics. They desire freedom for themselves, but that is of no great merit; men in general want freedom of every kind for themselves. But the freedom of creeds which we reject and deny, terrifies and troubles many among us. If we inquire into the origin of this terror, we shall find that it rests on the notion entertained by many Catholics, that freedom of worship is of antichristian origin. The consequences of this error have been seen in many blood-stained and deplorable pages in the book of history, though every impartial judge will confess that the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition and of the edict of Nantes fall short of the horrors of the British reformation and its reign of terror." The sentiments of Count Montalembert were received by the congress with great applause—a proof that the principle of religious toleration is now generally accepted by at least the Roman Catholic laity. Most of the papers of the Catholic world have likewise bestowed an unqualified approval of this speech, and only the great organ of ultramontanism, the *Monde*, of Paris, with a few other sheets, have rejected the views of the distinguished orator as uncatholic.

GREEK CHURCH.

RUSSIA.

Missions of the Russian Church.—The only branch of the Greek Church which is carrying on missionary operations among the Pagan races, and contributing its share to the Christianization and civilization of the world, is the Church of Russia. Though remaining far behind most of the Protestant and Roman Catholic countries both as to the zeal displayed and the results obtained in the foreign mission field, the Church of Russia has made praiseworthy efforts for the Christianization of the tribes inhabiting the vast dominions of Russia in Northern Asia, as well as those living in the Russian territory in North-western America.

There was a time at the beginning of the present century when it seemed that the Church of Russia would be thoroughly rejuvenated, and, in particular, take hold with ardent zeal of the missionary work. This time was the second half of the reign of Alexander I., and the first years of the reign of Nicholas I., when the agents of the British Bible Society circulated thousands of Bibles in all the provinces of European Russia, and received the most cordial support in this work from the metropolitans and bishops of the Russian Church; when the Emperor himself was not only a protector, but a member of the Bible Society; when the government extended its patronage to the labors of the Scotch missionaries in the Crimea and in Caucasia, of the Basle missionaries in Georgia and Armenia, and of the London missionaries in Siberia. Unfortunate influences subsequently made Emperor Nicholas the persecutor of the Protestant missions, which, by a series of imperial ukases, issued from 1835 to 1840, were almost wholly destroyed. The missions of the Church of Russia of course survived. Most of them are connected with the name of the priest Benjamin, who is now under the name of Innocentius I., Archbishop of Kamtschatka, and superintendent of all the Polar Churches.

This gifted and distinguished missionary commenced his operations in 1823, upon the Peninsula Alashka, which belongs to Russian America, and upon the adjoining Aleutian and Fox Islands. The first missions in this region had been planted toward the close of the eighteenth century, through the efforts of a Russian merchant, Shelikov, the founder of the Russo-American Commercial Association, but they did not thrive until the arrival of Benjamin. He learned the language of the natives, taught them how to read and to write, and translated into their language portions of the Bible, and of the books of the Russian Church. Since 1830 the conversion of the Aleutians was easily and happily completed.

After this, Benjamin, who sometimes resided upon the Aleutian Islands, and sometimes at Novo-Archangelsk, upon the Island of Sitka, directed his attention to the tribes inhabiting the continent of Russian America. It was especially the wild, romantic Indian tribe of the Kolooshes, who lived south of Sitka, among whom he labored. The missions among this tribe met, however, with only partial success. From 1841 to 1860 the

number of converts amounted to about four thousand seven hundred; but part of them did not fully abandon their former Pagan usages and mode of life. Among another tribe, living on the Cook Inland, the Kenaiz, the missionaries were more successful. In the one year 1847, four hundred adult members of the tribe were baptized, and the Christianization of the whole tribe has since made satisfactory progress. Among several other tribes the missionary work was commenced with partial success. The missionaries found a particular desire for embracing Christianity among the Kolchans, the northernmost of the tribes of Russian America.

In all the colonies of Russian America there were in 1860, according to a statement of the Russian Captain Golovnin, seven parish churches and thirty-five chapels, which were served by twenty-seven priests. The superintendence over the parish priests, as well as the missionaries, belongs to the Bishop of Novo-Archangelsk, upon the Island of Sitka, (whose seat is said, however, to have been recently transferred to Yakutsk, Siberia.) Their bishop, in turn, is subordinate to the Archbishop of Kamtschatka, and of the Aleutian and Carilian Islands, who is the superintendent of all the Polar Churches.

The present Archbishop of Kamtschatka, (since 1840,) already mentioned, is the distinguished priest Benjamin, the father of these Polar missions of the Russian Church, who, as Archbishop, has assumed the name of Innocentius I. His diocese is one of the most extensive of the world, and no other bishop has to overcome an equal amount of hardship in the visitation of his diocese. His labors in North-eastern Asia have been very successful. The Kamtschadales were wholly Christianized about the year 1847. Being formally Nomads, they now inhabit small villages, and, to the number of 5,000, visit the churches, which, at ten different localities of the Peninsula, have been erected for them.

An important mission has been recently opened in the Amoor Territory, which was united with the Russian empire in 1858. It is likely that from it the knowledge of Christianity will soon spread into Northern China.

In order to perpetuate and extend the missionary operations in these regions of Asia, a missionary seminary has been established at Yakutsk, Siberia. It has already educated many able and zealous missionaries, and promises to exert a great influence on the progress of Christianity in Eastern Asia.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

Professor Lechler, of Leipsic, publishes from a Vienna Codex a work of the celebrated reformer, John Wiclif, on Pastoral Theology, which, as the editor states, has never been published before. Dr. Lechler expresses the opinion that it was compiled between the years 1367 and 1378, and he commends it highly for its truly evangelical and estimable sentiments.

Mohammed has found a new biographer among the German scholars, Theodor Nöldeke, (*Das Leben Mohammeds.* Hanover, 1863.) His work is very brief, containing only one hundred and ninety-one pages, and written more in a popular than a learned style. Still it rests upon the most profound and extensive study of all the sources, as the author has proved by a learned history of the Koran, which he published a few years ago.

New investigations on the Pharisees and Sadducees are given in a pamphlet by Abraham Geiger, (*Sadducaeer und Pharisaeer.* Breslau, 1863,) one of the most learned Jewish scholars now living. This pamphlet is a sequel to a larger work by the same author, published five years ago and entitled, "The Original and the Translations of the Bible in their Dependence upon the Inner Development of Judaism." The entirely new opinions which Mr. Geiger advanced in this work met with much contradiction,

which induced the author to write the above pamphlet. In it he undertakes to show that the Sadducecan party arose from a union between the old families and the celebrated family of the sons of Zadock, and that they formed a sacerdotal nobility which rigidly adhered to the primitive form of worship, and with which, at the time of Christ, the party of Herod united. The Pharisees, on the other hand, were, according to Mr. Geiger's opinion, the popular party which later, in the form of Rabbinism, obtained a complete victory over the opposite party.

The most important works on the history of the Popes have nearly all been written by Germans: thus that of Innocent III., by Hurter; that of Gregory VII., by Voigt and Gfrörer; that of Alexander III., by Reuter. To them must now be added a work by Dr. G. Voigt on Pope Pius II. and his Times, which has just been completed by the publication of the third volume. (*Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini, als Papst Pius II.* Berlin, 1863.)

Dr. Spiegel, one of the standard authorities on everything that refers to the sacred books of the Parsees and their language, the Zená, has published a posthumous work of the distinguished Orientalist, Fr. Windishmann, entitled "Zoroastrian Essays," (*Zoroastrische Studien.* Berlin, 1863,) and treating of the mythology and ancient religions history of Central Asia. Spiegel calls this work a "highly important one," which will always maintain a high rank among the works that are written for the elucidation of the Iranian antiquity.

"The Preparation of Evangelical Theologians for the Ministry," (*Bildung der Evangelischen Theologen.* Heidelberg, 1863,) is the title and subject of a work by Professor Schenkel, of Heidelberg, a man of considerable influence in the present religious movements of Germany. Besides a discussion of the question, how theological students ought to be practically trained for their important mission, the book gives the first complete history of the evangelical preachers' seminaries of Germany prior to 1838.

Professors Gess and Riggenbach, of the University of Basel, Switzerland, both well known as authors of the evangelical school of modern German theology, publish a volume of "Apologetical Essays," (*Apologetische Beiträge.* Basel, 1863.) The volume consists of an essay by Gess on "the Right of Doubting and the Conquest of Doubt," and of one by Riggenbach, on "God's Holiness and Man's Sin."

New works (and also editions of former works) on Christian Doctrines and Christian Ethics are still being published in large numbers. We notice among the most recent: A. Schweizer, (Professor in Zurich,) "System of Christian Doctrines, according to Protestant Principles," (*Christliche Glaubenslehre*, vol. i. Leipsic, 1863.) Culman, "Christian Ethics," (*Christliche Ethic*, vol. i. Stuttgardt, 1863.) Ebrard, "System of Christian Doctrine," (*Christliche Glaubenslehre*, new edition,) a well-known standard work of the evangelical theology of Germany. Plitt, "*Evangelische Glaubenslehre*" is announced as being in press by the firm of Perthes, of Gotha. A new edition of one of the old standard works of Lutheran Theology, J. Gerhard's "*Loci Theologici*," is being brought out by E. Preuss. Berlin, 1863.

Of the commentary to the Old Testament by Keil and Delitzsel, Part 2, vol. i, containing the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, is out. Among other exegetical works we find: Keerl, on the Unity of the Biblical Primitive History, (Genesis, i–iii,) and the Harmony of the Biblical Cosmogony with Geology, with special reference to the views of Dr. Delitzch, Dr. Keil, and Dr. Hölemau. Bäumlein, Commentary to the Gospel of John, (Stuttgardt.) Hilgenfeld, a Review of the recent literature on the books of Ezra and Daniel, (Jena.)

The recent literature of Germany continues to be very rich in new works treating of the relations between natural sciences on the one hand, and theology and philosophy on the other. Among them we notice Mr. Von Schleiden's three lectures on "The Age of the Human Race, the Origin of the Species, and the Position of Men in Nature." (*Das Alter des Menschen Geschlechts, etc.* Leipsic, 1863.) The author is well known as one of the best botanists of Germany. Karl Riel's "Nature and History," (*Natur und Geschichte.* Leipsic, 1863,) is the

beginning of a work whose task it is to show the mutual relations between nature and history, and, resulting therefrom, the inseparable connection between the history of mankind and natural sciences. The first volume, which is to be regarded as an introduction into the whole work, treats of "The History of Mankind and the Universe."

Students of the Scriptures in the original languages will be glad to learn that a new (seventh) edition of the excellent Hebrew Grammar of Professor Ewald has been published, (*Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache.* Göttingen.) A posthumous work of Dr. K. H. A. Lipsius, containing grammatical investigations upon the Greek of the Bible, has been edited by his brother, Professor Lipsius, of Vienna, (*Grammatische Untersuchungen, über die Biblische Gracität.* Leipsic.) New and entirely revised editions have also been published of the Hebrew Dictionaries of Gesenius and Fürst.

FRANCE.

A translation of the complete works of the Emperor Julian, (*Œuvres Completes de l'Empereur Julien, par M. E. Talbot.* Paris, 1863.) will be welcomed by such friends of historical studies as cannot read the Greek language. The Emperor Julian, who was so egregiously mistaken in believing himself able to arrest the decay of paganism and to make it again the state religion of the Roman Empire in the place of Christianity, is a character which inspires even now all friends of historical research with great interest. No work, of course, can give a better clue to the character of such a man than his own writings and letters.

Three or four years ago Mr. Prevost Paradoe, one of the editors of the *Journal des Debats*, called the attention of the literary world of France to the merits of Samuel Vincent, one of the earliest and most devoted champions of the principle of religious toleration in Europe. Mr. Vincent was from 1822 to 1837 Protestant pastor in Nimes, and in some respects ahead of his age. The views which he advanced on the relation between Church and State were little appreciated during his lifetime; but they are now becoming the opinions of all Europe. One of the chief works of Vincent, entitled "*Meditations Religieuses*," and giving his views on religion and Christianity, has been recently republished in Paris, with a sketch of the life and writings of Vincent, by F. Fontanès, and an introduction by Athanase Coquesel, Jr., (*Meditations, etc.* Paris, 1863.)

The "History of Christian Doctrines," by the late Prof. Gieseler, of the University of Göttingen, has been translated by Prof. Bruch, of Strasburg, and A. Hobert. (*Gieseler, Histoire des Dogmes.* Paris, 1863.)

One of the best informed writers on Russia, who publishes, under the *nom de plume* Schédo-Terroli, "Studies on the Future of Russia," has recently brought out the seventh volume of this work, which treats of "Toleration, and the Religious Schism of this Work," (*Etudes sur l'Avenir de la Russie*, 7e Etude. Berlin, 1863.) It is quite an extensive work, from a man who writes with a most minute knowledge, on a subject which is of growing importance for the Protestant and Roman Catholic world.

Abbé Migne has commenced the publication of a "Dictionary of Catholic Missions," to be edited by Lacroix and Djunkovskoy. The first volume, which contains the "Dictionary of Missionaries," is out. The whole is to be completed in two volumes, and forms part of an encyclopedic series, called by the publisher "The Third Catholic Encyclopedia."

Father Gratry, who is regarded as one of the best Catholic writers on philosophical subjects, has commenced the publication of a commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, (*Commentaire sur l'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu.* Paris, 1863.)

Count Montalembert has published, in pamphlet form, the great speech on a "Free Church in a Free State" which he delivered at the Catholic Congress of Malines, and which attracted to so high a degree the attention and admiration of the world. ("*L'Eglise Libre dans l'Etat Libre.*" Paris, 1863.) The speech is regarded as one of the master-works of the distinguished orator. A full account of the congress has been published by Chantrel, one of the editors of the late *Univers*, under the title "*Malines, Fêtes and Congrès.*"

Of several works now in the course of publication we notice the appearance of vol. vi of Pastor Puaux, (*Histoire de la Reformation Française,*) and of vols. iii and iv of Abbé Jagers, (*Histoire de l'Eglise Catholique en France d'après les documents les plus authentiques depuis son origine jusqu'au concordat de Pie* vii.

A translation of the complete works of St. John Chrysostom has been commenced, "under the direction and with the collaboration" of some monks calling themselves "the priests of the Immaculate Conception of St. Dizier." The title-page claims this to be the first translation of the complete works of this celebrated preacher of the ancient Greek Church into French. The whole work will contain ten or eleven volumes.

The agitation which the "Life of Jesus," by M. Renan, has produced in France remains unabated. The sale of the book already exceeds one hundred thousand copies, and translations in nearly every language of Europe have made their appearance. Of refutations there is no want. The October number of Reinwald's Monthly Bulletin of French Literature contains no less than twelve new works on Renan's, most of which are, however, small pamphlets. Among them are the following: Father Felix, the most celebrated pulpit orator of the Roman Catholic Church of France, "*M. Renan et sa Vie de Jesus,*" originally published as an article in a religious quarterly, (*Etudes Religieuses ;*) Napoleon Roussel, (a Protestant pastor,) *Le Jesus de M. Renan,* (one of the best pamphlets published on the subject;) Pressensé, (editor of the Revue Chretienne,) *l'Ecole critique et Jesus Christ à propos de la Vie de Jesus de M. Renan ;* Pastoral Letters of the Bishops of Nimes and Grenoble; Olgo, (a priest of the Russian Church,) *Reflexions d'un Orthodoxe de l'Eglise Grecque sur la Vie de Jesus de M. Renan.* Pressensé, in an article in the "Christian Work" of London, says that the best reply that has yet proceeded from the Catholic camp is the article of a pious layman, well known in Paris for works of charity and benevolence, M. Cochin, in the *Correspondent.*

Art. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Quarterly Church Review, October, 1863. (New York.)—1. Stanley's Lectures and the Oriental Churches. 2. The Doctrine and Rationale of Sacraments. 3. Responsibility of Belief. 4. The Anglican Church and Italian Reform. 5. Papal Intermeddling. 6. The Rt. Rev. James Hervey Otey, D.D., LL.D.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, October, 1863. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Anglo-American Sabbath. 2. University Education. 3. Witherspoon's Theology. 4. Micah's Prophecy of Christ. 5. The Children of the Covenant, and "their Part in the Lord." 6. Miracles. 7. The Beautiful Things of Earth. 8. Relation of the Church and State. Recent Explorations in Africa. (*Additional note.*)

Boston Review, October, 1863. (Boston.)—1. Forms of Sound Words. 2. Liberal Religion. 3. A Phenomenon of Calvinism. 4. Colenso's Ciphering Reciphered. 5. Philip Van Artevelde. 6. John Calvin. 7. Short Sermons.

New Englander, October, 1863. (New Haven.)—1. Cemeteries. 2. The Sanction of all Law, Divine. 3. Review of Tennyson's "Two Voices." 4. Ecumenical Councils. 5. Armenian History. 6. Herbert Spencer on Ultimate Religious Ideas. 7. The Monroe Doctrine. 8. Edward Irving.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review, October, 1863. (New York.)—1. Presbyterianism: its Affinities. 2. The Sources of Crime. 3. False Tendency and Radical Defect in Education. 4. American New Testament Commentaries. 5. Mark ii, 23, as compared with Matthew xii, 1, and Luke vi, 1. 6. Draper's Intellectual Development of Europe. 7. The Chinese Classics. 8. Roger Bacon in the Light of New Documents.

Bibliotheca Sacra and Biblical Repository, October, 1863. (Andover, Mass.)—1. The Pre-existence of the Soul. 2. Stoddard's Theological Lectures. 3. Biblical Cosmology and the Doctrine of the Fall of the World. 4. Constantine the Great, and the Downfall of Paganism in the Roman Empire. 5. Authorship of the Pentateuch. 6. The Doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church. 7. Egyptology, Oriental Archæology and Travel. 8. Scheler's Dictionary of French Etymology. 9. Recent Theological Literature of Germany.

The article on the Pre-existence of the Soul is a very valuable condensation of an elaborate German volume by Prof. Bruch of Strasburg. The article on Biblical Cosmology relates to a stupendous theory, explanatory of the Mosaic Cosmology, by Dr. Keerl of Germany, of which Dr. Warren gives an interesting summary; but the article would have interested us still more had it been like the first, a pure condensation. The *heavens and the earth* of Gen. i, 1, are the solar system before its separation into sun and planets, and, of course, the days are immense periods. The chapter is made the nucleus of a grand romance of the universe, which, for aught we know, may be its true history.

Dr. Warren notices, with a somewhat summary sweep, the view of "a Mr. Rorison, of England," that the first chapter of Genesis possesses the rhythm, refrains, and self-completeness of a poem; pronouncing it "a notion," "an elusion," contradicted by two catalogues of Scripture texts which he gives; the second of which catalogues relates to the second chapter of Genesis, and has therefore nothing to do with the poem; and the first presents not the slightest collision with it. As to "elusion," or dodge, if that term designates an evasion of the literal sense of the chapter as it would be understood by an intelligent child, Keerl would be to Rorison as a camel to a gnat. The reconciliation of either with the terms of the Fourth Commandment would be equally difficult and equally easy, both requiring that the literal Day of the Decalogue shall correspond with the symbolic day of the cosmogony. The hymnic view furnishes just as suitable a basis for the normal cosmogonical phraseology of the Bible as the Keerlic.

If our readers will compare our notice of Rorison's essay in "Replies to Essays and Reviews" with our notice of Dana's Geology in the Quarterly following, they will find a curious coincidence. They will find that the schematism of the creation which Mr. Rori-

son found in the "Hymn" precisely accords with the schematism found by Prof. Dana in geology! Two independent minds separately drew a draft of creation, the one from the psalm of the first chapter of Genesis, and the other from science, and they precisely correspond! The hymnic view therefore has, if required, an ample scientific basis.

If Dr. W. will take the trouble to procure and read this same "a Mr. Rorison" before he sweeps him off the boards, he may find proofs of the Hymnic character of that chapter which he will scarce refute. There is no psalm or prophecy in the old Testament bearing in its internal structure a more unequivocally poetic character. The assignment of its authorship to Adam, and the suggestion of its forming a part of the Patriarchal hymnology, were only thoughts furnished as pleasing to our own fancy, tallying indeed with associate facts, but claiming no historical basis.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW. Third New York Series. (New York.) October, 1863.—1. Catholics and the Anti-Draft Riots. 2. New England Brahminism. 3. Visions and Revelations. 4. Return of the Rebellious States.

In Dr. Brownson's present position in the American Romish communion we seem to recognize the providential wisdom of his being allowed to collapse under the sway of the Pope. He is telling truth to the Romanists of this country, unwelcome yet powerful, which would be wholly unheard by them from Protestant lips or pen. His graphic descriptions of the demoralization of our Romanist clans, so faithfully true to life, are by him intended to point to reformation and regeneration. We heartily wish him success. Closed as Romanist ears are to Protestant effort, it is consoling to find at any rate one voice within their pale that recognizes the degradation and seeks to point them to virtue, piety, truth, education, and freedom. These traits are the indestructible remnants of Yankee Protestantism imported by him into their camp, and it would be well for them could they appreciate the lessons of wisdom he inculcates. Dr. Brownson is the only man we know in our land who is at all dangerous to Protestantism. Should the policy he preaches be adopted, should Romanism put off the dirty habiliments of incivilization and sin, and stand up in the better spirit of our age, there are historical and esthetical, not to say doctrinal and spiritual associations about her that might fascinate countless thousands if not millions into her fold. Terrible and terribly repulsive in our land is the Church of Kempis, Pascal, and Fenelon. It is not "the Church in the catacombs," but, largely the Church in the whisky cellars. That Church itself is the most

unanswerable witness against itself; and often do we in reading his pages think to ourselves, "How is it that this keen-sighted man does not see in all this the demonstration that Romanism is a false and fatal delusion?" And then we reply to ourself, "This blindness is not simply judicial, but providential."

Dr. Brownson may retort that Irish and Catholic degradation is the result of Saxon and Protestant oppression. We reply first, it was the Pope and Romanism that first subdued Ireland under the sway of the Saxon; and second, that the Waldenses of Piedmont have been more oppressed than the Catholics of Ireland, but their morals are far more pure than those of their Romish oppressors. No, Dr. Brownson, it is not simply English oppression, cruel and unprincipled as that has been, but Romish priestcraft that has demoralized Ireland and sent her mob material to demoralize our metropolis and curse our country with disloyalty, clannishness, ignorance, and rapine.

English Reviews.

The Christian Remembrancer, October, 1863. (London.)—1. Miracles. 2. A Dialogue on the best form of Government. 3. The Abbé Prompsault—His Life and Works. 4. Prehistoric Man. 5. Bishop Blomfield. 6. French Ecclesiology. 7. Mr. Kinglake's Crimea. 8. The Life of Bishop Wilson. 9. Neale's Essays on Liturgiology and Church History.

The Edinburgh Review, October, 1863. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Queensland. 2. Gregorovius's Medieval Rome. 3. Cadastral Survey of Great Britain. 4. Macknight's Life of Lord Bolingbroke. 5. Austin on Jurisprudence. 6. The Royal Academy. 7. Chinchona Cultivation in India. 8. Phillimore's Reign of George III. 9. Tara: a Mahratta Tale. 10. The Colonial Episcopate.

The Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, October, 1863. (London.)—1. On Current Methods of Biblical Criticism. 2. Contributions to Modern Ecclesiastical History. No. 2. The Gustavus Adolphus Society. 3. The Chronology, Topography, and Archæology of the Life of Christ. By Rev. J. P. Thompson, D.D., New York. 4. The Epistle of Barnabas: from the Codex Sinaiticus. 5. Buddhism: its Origin, Doctrines, and Prospects. 6. Æthiopic Liturgies and Hymns. 7. The Bordeaux Pilgrim in Palestine. 8. Renan's Life of Jesus.

The London Quarterly Review. October, 1863. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Progress of Engineering Science. 2. Life and Writings of Thomas Hood. 3. Antiquity of Man. 4. Co-operative Societies. 5. Japan. 6. Anti-Papal Movement in Italy. 7. Froude's Queen Elizabeth. 8. The Church of England and her Bishops.

The National Review, October, 1863. (London.)—1. Recent Criticism of the Old Testament. 2. Distortions of the English Stage: Macbeth. 3. Health of the British Army at Home and Abroad. 4. Mr. Freeman's History of Federal Government. 5. Poland as it is. 6. The Royal Supremacy, and the History of its Introduction. 7. Mr. Browning's

Poems. 8. The Effect of the Gold Discoveries. 9. The Recent Foreign Policy of our Government. 10. The late Sir G. C. Lewis. 11. M. Renan's Life of Jesus.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1863. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The French Conquest of Mexico. 2. Romola. 3. Miracles. 4. Gervinus on Shakspeare. 5. The Treaty of Vienna: Poland. 6. Wit and Humor. 7. The Critical Character. 8. Victor Hugo. 9. Mackay's Tübingen School.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, (Wesleyan.) October, 1863. (London.)—1. The Life and Works of Heinrich Zschokke. 2. Howitt on the Supernatural. 3. The "Situation" in Poland. 4. Thomas Hood. 5. Farrar's Bampton Lecture. 6. Recent French Literature. 7. Jurisdiction in Colonial Churches. 8. The General Post-Office. 9. The Sinai Bible.

The article on the Supernatural admits the reality of a large amount of the phenomena of spiritualism, but maintains that they are probably not supernatural nor the work of supernatural agents; but as Humboldt suggested "they are disjointed indications and fragments of some higher law which at present eludes us, but which when discovered will probably unravel some of the hidden mysteries of our being." The writer shows that neither the admission of their reality as supernatural, nor the denial of their reality as facts, any way affects the credibility of the Scripture miracles. He admits the reality of second sight and of the appearance of departed spirits, that is, of apparitions or ghosts, to the eyes of the living, of which he narrates some instances.

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1863. (London.)—1. The Scottish Philosophy. 2. The Perfection of Christ's Humanity. 3. Father Lacordaire. 4. Döllinger on "The Church and the Churches." 5. Whately's Preliminary Dissertation. 6. Date of the Books of Chronicles. 7. Slavery and the Bible. 8. Mexico, Ancient and Modern. 9. Plato and Christ. 10. Life of Dr. Leifchild. 11. Biblical and Miscellaneous Intelligence.

This organ of the Free Church of Scotland publishes at full length the "Address to Christians throughout the World," issued by "the clergy of the Confederate States of America." To it is appended a note telling from how high a source the document comes, and explaining how favorable a view it exhibits of slave-holding Christianity. After giving the census of communicants, white and black, it adds: "Thus has God blessed us in gathering from the children of Africa more than twice as many as are reported from all the converts in the Protestant Missions throughout the heathen world."

What a missionary institution the slave-trade has proved to be! And how becoming it is for an "evangelical" review to publish such a note without comment! These evangelical editors leave the defense of truth and righteousness to the Westminster Review

and Francis W. Newman. What wonder that infidelity should triumph where Christianity is dishonored with such representatives?

British Quarterly Review, October, 1863. (London.)—1. Renan's Vie de Jésus. 2. Peasant Life in Switzerland. 3. Fawcett's Manual of Political Economy. 4. The Sinaitic Codex. 5. Home in Poland. 6. Dr. Whewell's Moral Works. 7. Self-government in India. 8. Recent Works of Fiction—Romola. 9. Modern Anthropology. 10. Epilogue on Affairs and Books.

If a great change has taken place in English feeling toward the United States in regard to the great rebellion, intelligence of the fact does not seem to have reached the hostile Quarterlies—especially the British. Though it be the representative of the evangelical dissenting sentiment, comprehending, we should suppose, a large share of the reflecting mind of the moral middle class, it has been the most unscrupulous of all the set—a sanctimonious counterpart of the London "Times." Its editor, Dr. Vaughan, is a man of some standing in his sect and in literature. In the year 1857 we had occasion to note that of all the Quarterlies that reviewed our antislavery struggle, the British was the most ultra antislavery, the most unsparing and unexcusing. Since the gun of Sumter its sympathies have been, not with the national government, but with rebellion; not with the side that submitted to war rather than accept the nationalization of slavery, but with the slaveholding oligarchy. The malevolence, the varying mendacities through which the editor revolves, as the revolution of affairs carries him around the compass of subterfuge, we need not trace, but the following, from the editorial "Epilogue" at the close of the number, will form a specimen:

> No amount of sophistry can save the slave system of the South from the execration of good men. But we cannot see the religion or the morality of attempting to put down one horror by means of a flood of horrors still more horrible. Such is the present policy of the North, even in the case of those who are sincere abolitionists. In the case of the great majority, who use the slave question for purely political purposes, the cant of insincerity is added to the other ingredients of the cup. Popular principles, and the good name of Puritanism, have suffered injury during the last two years which the next half-century will hardly suffice to retrieve. It is with deep sorrow that we thus write. The hoarded miseries for humanity with which the Northern States of America are charged will be felt in their time. England, do what she may, will have her full share of them. But England will know how to do her duty.

In the article on Modern Anthropology it is said that Darwin's theory "has been all but universally accepted" in England. The article closes with the following summary:

> We believe in the unity of the human species for these reasons: 1. While there are differences of color and external formation, there is an *essential identity* in anatomical structure and physiological endowment, as well as in mental faculties.

and characteristics. 2. The differences alluded to are not greater than may be reasonably accounted for on well-known physical principles. To those who doubt the efficiency of "conditions of life" in modifying type, we would point out the specialization of formation already evinced in a few generations in the States of North America. 3. The various races, however distinct in appearance, are all fertile among each other, and produce fertile offspring to indefinite generations—an infallible and absolute predicate of *species*.

Finally, we hold that man is not amenable (except for arbitrary and scientific purposes) to zoological classification, but is as much removed from animal nature as animals are from plants, or these from inorganic matter—removed by the possession of distinct orders of attributes as marked as those which separate the other kingdoms of nature. In vegetables we have the life of the Body; the somatic, or organic life. In animals we have superadded the senses, the emotions, the volitions, and certain intellectual manifestations, which, collectively, may be termed the life of the Soul—Ψυχη. In man alone have we the tripartite nature of Body, Soul, and *Spirit*. In him alone is there any *self*-consciousness, conscience, knowledge of good and evil, possession of abstract idea, and language wherein to clothe it. In him alone is there evidence of unlimited capacity for improvement. Above all, in him alone is there any aspiration after a spiritual life and a glorious immortality. These things, we conceive, remove him more essentially from classification with the brutes, be it as species, genus, order, or sub-class, than do the possession or non-possession of a *hippocampus minor*, or a *posterior cornu* to the lateral ventricles. It is these alone that entitle him to his position as a little lower than the angels, as an heir of God and joint-heir of Jesus Christ.

German Reviews.

Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. (Journal of Scientific Theology. Edited by Dr. Hilgenfeld. Third Number, 1863.)—1. Hilgenfeld, The Prophet Ezra, and the most recent works on the subject. 2. D. F. Strauss, The History of the Piece of Money in the Mouth of the Fish. Matt. xvii. 24–27. 3. Paul, The Historical Proofs of a Real Resurrection of Christ according to the New Testament Accounts. 4. Hilgenfeld, The Gospels and the Historical Character of Jesus. 5. Boehmer, The Origin of Christmas.

Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie. (Year-book of German Theology. Edited by Dr. Liebner, Dr. Dorner, and others. Third Number, 1863.)—1. Hamberger, The Idea of a Heavenly Corporality. 2. Ritschst, On the Saving Power of the Death of Jesus in the New Testament. (Second Article.) 3. Diestel, The Idea of the Theocratical King.

Theologische Quartalschrift. (Theological Quarterly, 1862. Second Number.)—1. Speil, The Authenticity of the Book of Daniel. 2. Hefele, Pope Gregory IX., and Emperor Frederic II.

Third Number.—1. Langen, The First Readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 2. Mey, On Catechisms.

Studien und Kritiken. (Essays and Reviews, edited by Dr. Ullmann and Dr. Rothe. First Number, 1864.)—1. Schmidt, Berthold of Ratisbon. 2. Pischon, The Constitution of the Orthodox Greek Church. 3. Köster, On the Pure Religious Ideas in Homer. 4. Valentiner, Plotin and his Enneads. 5. Weiss, Review of Hilgenfeld's Canon of the New Testament. 6. Hundeshagen, Review of Sudhoff's Commentary to the Heidelberg Catechism.

This number of the "Studien" is one of the best that has been published for many years. Nearly all the subjects are of general

interest. In the first article Professor Schmidt, of Strasburgh, a Church historian well known for many excellent works, gives a sketch of the celebrated Berthold of Ratisbon, one of the most famous preachers of the middle ages, and whom many of his admirers count even now among the greatest orators Germany ever produced. Cotemporaneous writers give the most marvelous accounts of his success. Thus Hermann, of Altaich, reports that often more than forty thousand people thronged round his pulpit; later accounts swelled the number of his hearers to one hundred thousand, yea, two hundred thousand. Yet the sermons of Berthold were almost unknown until thirty-eight years ago Dr. Kling (Professor of Protestant Theology at several German universities in succession) published them for the first time. Their theological contents and beautiful language attracted at once the attention of both theologians and philologists, and Jacob Grimm introduced the book to the literary world by an extensive notice. A translation of the sermons from the medieval into the modern German were published by F. Göbel, a Catholic priest, in two volumes, at Schaffhausen, 1850, (second edition 1857.) Both the complete edition of the original by Kling and the likewise incomplete translation of the sermons by Göbel had produced a widely felt desire for a critical edition of the complete works of Berthold. This desire of the German scholars and theologians Professor Pfeiffer, of the University of Vienna, one of the leading German writers on the medieval literature of their country, has undertaken to fulfill by publishing the first volume of such an edition in 1862. At his request, and in order to call the general attention of theologians to the important publication, Professor Schmidt has prepared the above article for the Studien, treating of the career of Berthold as a preacher.

The second article, on the Orthodox Greek Church, is from the pen of C. N. Pischon, formerly preacher of the Prussian Embassy in Constantinople. It gives an interesting sketch on the History of the Greek Church since the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks.

Zeitschrift fur Historische Theologie. (Journal of Historical Theology. Edited by Dr. Niedner. First Number, 1864.)—1. Walte, The Gradual Transition of Bremen from the Lutheran to the Reformed Church. 2. Otto, The Dialogue Attributed to the Patriarch Gennadius, on the Main Points of Christian Faith. 3. Lieder, Excommunication, especially in the Protestant Church of Switzerland.

The dialogue entitled, "On Some Chief Points of the Christian Faith," (περί τινων κεφαλαίων τῆς ἡμετέρας πιστέως,) which is ascribed to the Patriarch Gennadius, of Constantinople, is of con-

siderable importance for the dogmatic controversy between the Greek and Latin Churches on the Holy Spirit. This dialogue expressly teaches that the Spirit proceeds from the Father "AND THE SON," which doctrine the Greeks have always maintained to be an adulteration of the ecumenical confessions of faith. The advocates of a union between the Greek and the Latin Churches have therefore naturally laid great stress on this passage, as, if the book itself were genuine, it would prove that the doctrine objected to by the Greeks was expressly taught by one of the most celebrated patriarchs. Professor Otto, of the Protestant Theological Faculty of Vienna, has however shown, in an article published in Niedner's Journal of Historic Theology, in 1850, that this dialogue does not belong to Gennadius, but that a unionist Greek (one in favor of a union with Rome) has taken it almost bodily from a Pseudo-Athanasian dialogue and falsely attributed it to Gennadius. Several German scholars, as Gieseler, (in his Church History, vol. iii,) and R. Hoffmann, (in his *Symbolik*, Leipzic, 1857,) have since declared their assent to the opinion of Professor Otto. Others, like Bähr (in Ersch's *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, section 1, vol. lviii, page 205,) and Wagenmann, (*Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie*, vol. v, page 10,) have since continued to cite the work as one of Gennadius, probably without knowing the article of Professor Otto. The latter, therefore, in the article in the last number of Niedner's Journal, recurs to the subject, and brings forward new arguments in support of his opinion.

French Reviews.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*August* 1, 1863.—2. HAVET, Review of the Life of Jesus, by Renan. 3. LINDAU, A Voyage Around Japan. (Second article.) 9. MAZADE, The Russian System. 10. TAILLANDIER, A Book on the History of Protestantism in France.

August 15.—3. CASIMIR PERIER, Memoirs of a British Diplomatist. 4. PAUL JANET, Contemporaneous Materialism in Germany. 6. AUDIGANNE, Railroads after the Completion of the European Net. 9. MILSAND, Meditations of a Protestant Pastor.

September 1.—2. CASIMIR PERIER, Reminiscences of a British Diplomatist. (Second article.) 3. AMPERE, The Struggles of Liberty at Rome. 5. LINDAU, A Voyage Around Japan. (Third article.)

September 15.—5. JULES SIMON, Primary Instruction and Popular Libraries in France. 6. SAVENEY, Spiritism and the Spirits.

October 1.—1. TAILLANDIER, The Tragedies of Henry Heine. 4. REVILLE, Apocalyptical Toleration among the Jews and the Christians. 6. JALOS, Madagascar, History of the Relations between Madagascar and France. 7. Public Instruction in Italy.

October 15.—1. RENAN, Natural and Historical Sciences. 2. BAILLEUX DE MARISEY, The City of Paris, Its Finances and Public Works since the Beginning of the Century. 4. LAUGEL, The Civil War in the United States. (1861–63.) 5. LINDAU, A Voyage Around Japan. (Fourth article.) 6. MAZADE, Eight Months of War in Poland. 7. JULES DE LASTEYRIE, Ireland and the Cause of its Mystery.

The *Revue des Deux Mondes* continues to devote a very large space of its columns to the discussion of the great religious questions of the day—the best proof how profoundly they agitate the highest literary circles of Europe. In the list of articles mentioned above we find a review of Renan's Life of Jesus, by Havet, Professor at the College de France; an essay on the History of French Protestantism, by the celebrated critic, Saint Rene Taillandier; a review of the recent materialistic literature of Germany, by Paul Janet; an article on the spiritualistic manifestations, by Saveney; an article by Reville, one of the most prolific writers of the critical school, on the Revelation of John; finally, a letter from Ernest Renan on Natural and Historical Sciences, giving a brief exposition of his present religious views. The *Revue* admits articles from eminent writers of all theological parties, though it evidently favors the school of which Renan is now the most famous representative.

The letter of Renan on the Relation of Natural to Historical Sciences expresses a regret that his early studies have been devoted to the latter in preference to the former. No sciences, he now thinks, can do more for an elucidation of the mysterious history of mankind and the universe than the natural sciences. His own views and speculations, which Renan develops at some length, resemble those of Hegel. He concludes his letter with the following remarks:

Does not Jesus live a thousand times more, is he not a thousand times more beloved now than he was at the moment when he lived? I do not refer to his reputation, his glory, which without being a vanity, is often a crying injustice. Many of the men who hold the first rank among mankind are and will remain unknown. "They live for God," as was said by the author of the treatise "*De Rationis Imperio*," an admirable treatise written by a cotemporary and countryman of Jesus. The greatest saints are the unknown saints, and God preserves the secret of the greatest merits which have ennobled a mortal being. A number of men, entirely unknown by the crowd, exercise in reality in the world a greater influence than men whose reputation makes the greatest noise. In God man is immortal. The categories of time and space are effaced in the absolute; what exists for the absolute is as much that which has been as that which will be. Thus live in God all the souls which have lived. Why should not the reign of the Spirit, the goal of the universe, be also the resurrection of every consciousness? The Spirit will be all-powerful, the idea will be all reality: what else signifies this language than that in the idea everything will revive? The manner in which these things will be accomplished cannot but escape us; for, I repeat, in thousands of centuries the condition of the world will perhaps be as different from the present condition as the mechanical atom is from a thought or from a sentiment.

This much we may however affirm, that the final resurrection will be made through science, through the science either of men or of some other intelligent being. The scientific reform of the universe is the work scarcely commenced which

devolves upon reason. A thousand times this attempt may be treated as a crime, a thousand times conservatism may cry out that we commit an outrage against God; but the progress of conscience is a fatal thing. Let us assume that our planet be condemned to reach only middling results, that habit, under the pretext of preserving the doctrines which it wants, should stifle the scientific spirit and incapacitate mankind for grand things: what would such a loss be for the whole universe? Not more than that of a grain of corn which falls upon a stone, or a germ of life which in the mysterious night of generation does not find the conditions favorable to its development.

The article by Jules Simon, one of the greatest thinkers of modern France, on Primary Instruction, is highly instructive and suggestive. It makes the following remarks on the circulation of the Bible:

In Protestant countries under every roof there is at least one book—the Bible. Every one knows of the number of Bibles given away in England. In Paris if you are present at a Protestant marriage you will always see the ceremony end in the giving of a Bible. It is a well-judged act of religion, and at the same time, in a secular point of view, it is a most useful custom for the poor. The presence of this one book brings back the recollection of school days, and perpetuates what was then learned. Now among Catholics the mass-book will be found rather than the Bible, and we must admit that even the mass-book is an exception. In most Churches the women tell beads upon their fingers, the men sing psalms from memory. At home they have nothing to read—not a journal, not even an almanac. Not only they read no books, but they see none! The visible sign of civilization is absent from the cottage. . . . The Protestants who give a Bible to every couple on whose union a blessing is implored, render service, not to Protestantism only, but to mankind. Why have not Christian communities thought of circulating millions of copies of the Sermon on the mount, properly illustrated, to take the place of the gross wood-cuts whose defects do not always consist of mere offense against good taste? With what ardor would liberal thinkers bring their mite toward so blessed a work.

Revue Chretienne—*Aug.* 15, 1863.—1. Pressense, The Critical School and Jesus Christ. 2. Kuhn, Memoirs of Madame Swetchine.

September 15.—Herzog, Fenelon and his Doctrine of Pure Love. 2. Kuhn, Moral Influence of Novels. 3. Peyre, Theodicy of Leibnitz.

We have already had occasion to speak of the article of Pressense against Renan. It is regarded in France, not only by orthodox Protestants, but also by many Roman Catholics, as the best that has yet been written. The article on Madame Swetchine gives an account of a Russian lady who, through the influence of De Maistre, was drawn toward and finally into the Church of Rome, and who for many years shone in the highest literary circles of Paris for her fervid piety, and great interest in the literary movements of the day. One of the most prominent members of the liberal Catholic school in France, Count de Falloux, has written her life, and more recently published an autobiographical work of hers, containing an account of the reasons which led her to Rome, and a collection of meditations and prayers. Mr. Kuhn's view of Madame Swetchine and her work is comprised at the conclusion of his article in these words: "As a

theologian, she does not rise above common prejudices. As a spiritual writer, she remains within the narrow domain of mystic aspirations. Her piety lacks air and liberty. There is in her nothing grand, except the sentiment to which she consecrated her life: to seek God, to find, and to love him. But this is better than everything else."

Art. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Watson's Theological Institutes Defended; the Teaching of Transcendental Philosophy shown to be at variance with Scripture and Matter-of-Fact: and the Bible proved to be Complete in itself, both in Teaching and Evidence. By Rev. John Levington. 12mo., pp. 283. For sale by T. K. Adams, Detroit. New York: Barnes & Burr. 1863.

This volume consists of a polemic upon the articles in the Methodist Quarterly by Rev. Mr. Cocker upon the metaphysics of "Watson's Institutes;" an issue with certain positions of Dr. Dempster in Natural Theology; a defense of Grenville Penn's Theories of Geology; and the substance of Leslie's Short Method with the Deists. Mr. Levington is evidently very sincere and honest in his retention and maintenance of views once current but now somewhat obsolete, and his discussions are conducted in the spirit of Christian courtesy. Without claiming to be an Athanasius, he recognizes that his position is *contra mundum*. As we are of the "world," he of course does not expect that we should entertain the same appreciation with himself of the successive tractates (except the last) in his neat volume.

We have never been able to understand why theologians have averred that the existence of a supreme deity could not be discovered by the reason of man. It seems to us an appalling concession to atheism. The steps by which the discovery is supposably attained are short, few, and obvious. The child asks, Who made me? Who made everything? Who made the world? And the child can understand the mother's answer. The positive elements of natural theology are often learned in five minutes at five years of age. Compare this simple process with the discoveries in Geometry, made beyond all doubt by natural human reason. Think of the numerous recondite steps to be taken by a matured mind before attaining the mastery of the forty-seventh of Euclid's First Book. The ignorance of the savage tribes of the earth of the existence of a God, admitting the fact, no more proves his existence undiscoverable by the human mind, than it proves that unaided man could not produce a school arithmetic.

If Mr. Levington finds his faith and piety sustained by his philosophy, well. But let him not attribute "skepticism" to those who find the same support from the reverse view. Individually, the training of the writer of these lines was in the mental and moral philosophy of Locke and Paley as text authors. Their influence upon his mind was fearfully deleterious. Locke's derivation of our ideas primitively from matter through sensation; secondarily, from the minds operating upon those sensations, was rife to him with materialism, with atheism. It was impossible for him to escape the conclusion that all our thoughts were but impressions from a material object upon a material sensorium, and then material impressions again of those material impressions, and so on. Let two mirrors shed their reflections into each other in row, and you have the very image of the thing. From Paley he understood that right and wrong were mere creatures of education. He was from all this to his own mind a theoretic Christian only by being a bad logician. After such a cramped process he founded the revival of the larger old philosophy of Cudworth, and Henry More, though modified and christened with the modern epithet transcendental, to be a relief to his suffocated soul. The Locke philosophy, whether directly derived from Locke or not, he did recognize, but never accept, in Watson. But if the writer of this volume accepts and finds his faith and philosophy in harmony, far be it from us to offer any disturbance to either. But as to the defense of Grenville Penn's geology, the revival of the Ptolemaic astronomy would be about as hopeful a procedure, and about as creditable to the Christian apologist.

Palmoni; or, the Numerals of Scripture a proof of Inspiration. A Free Inquiry. By M. Mahan, D.D., St. Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the General Theological Seminary. 12mo. pp. 176. New York: Appleton & Co. 1863.

That there is some sort of significance in some of the biblical numbers has been vaguely recognized by theologians in the commonplace but not very intelligible statement that "seven is a number of perfection;" and no theological scholar will deny the significance of a numeral in Rev. xiii, 18. The perusal of Professor Stuart's Excursus on Scripture Numerals in the appendix to his Commentary on the Apocalypse will place beyond doubt the belief that scriptural numerals are largely symbolical and significant. The realistic character of our modern mind is unreflectingly disposed to reject such symbolism as puerile. In doing so it forgets that revelation has had to accommodate itself to the infantile age of the human race. It forgets that printing and even writing were once

non-existent arts, and that the association of sacred truths with number and other symbols for impressive and mnemonic purposes may have been the wisest possible provision in the existing case. We see by this why in the account of the creation the number *seven* is fundamental; and why that number reigns throughout the Mosaic symbolism and reappears in rich luxuriance in the Apocalypse.

Professor Mahan's researches add a large amount to the results obtained in this peculiar field of research. The reader unacquainted with the past developments will see much that he will pronounce "curious;" far more than he will feel able to explain on the supposition of mere fancy; while few persons who are posted in the subject will hesitate to see that for the great mass of his positions he has made a strong case, a case which is capable of demonstrative proof or refutation by experiment.

The significant numbers developed by Professor Mahan are found in the names and chronological figures of Old and New Testaments. They disclose a whole series, or a number of serial sets, of coincidences of a most artificial character, explicable only upon the hypothesis of a divine intention maintained through ages in the production of the sacred canon. It becomes then a very unique proof of what must be called the miraculous unity of the one Holy Book. If this artificiality of character is fanciful, it can easily be shown by experimentation upon some great line of secular history, say Livy's History of Rome. This Professor Mahan has tried with, as he conceives, demonstrative results. His work then, if unsound, is liable to decisive refutation. We call the attention of biblical scholars to the subject.

The Headship of Christ and the Rights of the People. A collection of Essays, Historical and Descriptive Sketches, and Personal Portraitures. With the Author's celebrated Letter to Lord Brougham. By HUGH MILLER, author of "Footprints of the Creator," etc. Edited, with a Preface, by PETER BAYNE, A.M. 12mo., pp. 502. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard. 1863.

In the great battle fought by the evangelical Church in Scotland against a godless political lay intrusion, forcing unworthy ministers on the congregations, a stalwart champion was found in Hugh Miller. The best of his efforts in that battle are here before us. And as the battle is full of rich lessons, so these essays are full of grand utterances, vivid pictures, heroic spirit, and Christian doctrines. Christ, the sole head of the Church—his laws its sole rule—these were the grand principles with which old Scotland had once turned out old Popery, and young Scotland went out

from young secularism. The rich Christian democratic spirit of the work is truly American; and we confess to have received some lessons and impulses from its pages touching close upon the present discussion in our own American Methodism.

Literary Characteristics and Achievements of the Bible. By Rev. W. Trail, A.M. 12mo., pp. 368. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1863.

This work is admirably calculated to supply a vacancy in our denominational literature. The editor, Dr. Clark, says: "The author has brought to the composition of this volume a taste, a culture, and an earnestness of purpose which have left their impress upon every chapter. He manifestly entered into the spirit of his work. While, with a master hand, he discloses the beauties of the Bible—its high literary characteristics, and its wonderful achievements—he is constantly directing the reader to its Divine authorship. No one can rise from the perusal of this work without feeling that the blessed volume of which it treats is

> "On every line
> Marked with the seal of high Divinity;
> On every leaf bedewed with drops of love
> Divine, and with the eternal heraldry
> And signature of God Almighty stamped,
> From first to last."

"The religious public of Great Britain have attested their appreciation of its value in the successive editions of it that have been demanded. The English press has also bestowed upon it the highest encomiums. It now remains to be seen whether it shall have equal appreciation from the Christian public of America."—P. 3, Preface. The minister of the Gospel will find it a rich source of illustration. The Sunday-school library should ever possess a copy, and it would beyond all doubt be an inspiring and instructive book for the instructor of the Bible class, if not even a profitable and fascinating text-book for a class itself.

Sermons Preached before His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, during his Tour in the East in the Spring of 1862, with Notices of some of the Localities Visited. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford; Honorary Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen; Honorary Chaplain to the Prince of Wales. 12mo., pp. 272. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

This volume, done up in Scribner's handsome style, consists of two parts: Sermons preached in different regions of the East through which the Prince and his party passed, and Notices of objects and localities mostly in the Holy Land. The sermons are short, and have usually some local reference. They exhibit much of Stanley's

fresh and pictured style. The notices are a pleasant contribution to the existing treasures of sacred geography. Stanley's Christian unction as preacher would sometimes appear rather poetical than spiritual. His sermon on the "Mission of the Comforter" falls far below the spirit of Charles Julius Hare on the same subject. It has a rich glow, but it is rather of the imagination than of a true experience.

Heaven our Home. We have no Saviour but Jesus, and no Home but Heaven. By the author of "Meet for Heaven." 12mo., pp. 310. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1864.

In these days of political turmoil and mechanical improvements let us not wholly forget the purifying power of religious contemplative meditation. The numerous works of that kind issuing from the press are a propitious token that this is not wholly neglected. The volume before us, from its elevating topics, its depth of reflection, and its pure beauty of expression, is without question one of the best of its class. It is divided into Three Parts, treating of Heaven as a Home, the Heavenly Recognition, and the Interest of Heaven in Us. It is a pure gem for the Christian reader.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Das System der praktischen Theologie, von Dr. C. B. Moll. 8vo., pp. 404. Halle: Muhlmann.*

After centuries of confused use and abuse the term *Practical Theology* has at last received a fixed definition and determinate position in the organism of theological science. It is no longer to be confounded with a diluted, popularized edition of scientific theology "for students incompetent to learn the theoretic science," (Planck;) nor can it any more be used as a synonym of Christian Ethics or Pastoral Theology. It has taken its place in the circle of theological sciences as an independent department co-ordinate with Exegetical, Historical, and Systematic Theology. The Christian religion presents itself to the student under four aspects—as a divine revelation, as a history, as a system of doctrines and duties, and, finally, as a corporate life. As now the department of Exegetical Theology embraces all those sciences which in any way treat of the Holy Scriptures; that of Historical Theology, all which in any way treat of Sacred and Church History; that of Systematic Theology, all which set forth the doctrinal and ethical systems of

* These notices of German Theological publications are from the pen of Prof. Warren, of Bremen.

Christianity; so Practical Theology is that department of theologic science which treats of the *Functions of Church Life.* As such it embraces the subordinate sciences of Church government, edification, and worship. It includes and covers such special branches as "Pastoral Theology," "Homiletics," "Catechetics," "Christian Pedagogics," etc. Being the science of the collective functions of the Church regarded in her unity, it is able to give due attention and prominence to each of those functions—the regulative, the educational, and the edifying—a thing impossible under the old-fashioned arrangement. The attempt to compass the whole within the limits of a Pastoral Theology has led to frightful distortions of that important branch of ministerial education. The first impulse to this, as to so many other improvements in the domain of theological study, was given by Schleiermacher; and this conception of the nature and limits of Practical Theology has met with such favor that theologians of the most diverse schools, as, for instance, Roman Catholic von Drey, Protestant Nitzsch, Hegelian Marheineke, compromising Hagenbach, and Lutheran Harless, give in their unanimous support.

The work before us is a compendious, but thorough and very systematic treatise, covering the whole field of Practical Theology as now understood. Its author was for many years a successful and distinguished instructor in the University of Halle, but has recently been called to the superintendency of one of the dioceses of the Prussian United Church. The Introduction to the work consist of three chapters, filling forty-five pages. In the first of the three the real idea of the science is beautifully elaborated; in the second its history and literature are skillfully sketched; the third discusses the true method to be followed. The body of the work is then divided into two parts, the first of which is entitled "The Physiology of the Church; or, the Doctrine of the Organism of Ecclesiastical Life." This part is then subdivided into three sections, treating respectively of the "Nature of Ecclesiastical Life," "Forms of its Manifestation," and "Conditions of its Realization." These discussions take us half through the book. Part second then treats of the "Theory of the Ecclesiastical Functions," the first section being devoted to the "Theory of the Regulating Activities," (that is, Constitution, Legislating, and Administration;) the second to "The Theory of the Educative Activities," ("the Cherishing, the Instructional, and the Disciplinary Education;") and the third to the "Theory of the Edifying Activities," ("Arrangement of Forms of Worship, Performance of Acts of Worship, Execution of Ecclesiastical Acts.") This outline of the author's plan may convey

some idea of the work; but, from the novelty of its terminology, no adequate one. Could we give a fuller analysis of its contents it would be seen that our author meets and discusses every question which properly falls within the domain of his science as above defined. As he wrote for the purpose of furnishing his students a text-book to be used and enlarged upon in the lecture-room, the style is everywhere succinct, clear, and easy to be understood. Although not well adapted for translation into the English language, it cannot be studied without profit even in our country.

Evangelische Pædagogik. Von Dr. Christian Palmer. Third Edition. 8vo., pp. 694. Stuttgart. 1862.

Dr. Christian Palmer, of Tubingen, is one of the most distinguished cultivators of Practical Theology and its related subjects in all Germany. The preparation of the articles belonging to this department in Herzog's Cyclopedia was committed to him. The above work on the Evangelical Theory of education has already reached a third edition, and is well worthy of the attention and study of foreign theologians and educators. The stand-point of the author is sufficiently set forth in his very definition of education: "According to our conception education consists in the propagation from one generation to another of that Christian spirit, which overpowers the flesh, elevates man from sensuality and bestiality, makes him truly and completely free, and thus ennobles the whole life in all its ramifications."—P. 82. In an Introduction of ninety pages Dr. Palmer describes the rise and progress and present state of his science. He here sketches with a masterly hand the characteristic principles and practical workings of the various systems of education which have been employed in different ages, commencing with the ante-Christian ones, both Hebrew and Heathen, coming down through New Testament times, the era of the Church fathers, the Middle Ages, the Reformation; depicting the development of the Protestant idea of education by Spencer and Francke, the revolution inaugurated by Pestalozzi, Locke, Rousseau and others; and thus preparing the way for a thorough understanding of the different views and tendencies prevailing at the present time in the department of pedagogics. The body of the work consists of three parts, the first of which contains the author's general pedagogical principles; the second, their application to the whole domain of schooling proper; the third, their application to the case of imbeciles, deaf and dumb, blind, orphans, foundlings, etc. In Part I, under the head of "*Teleological Prin-*

ciple," we find a very interesting and instructive discussion of the end of education as determined by Christianity in distinction from ends that have been proposed or kept in view by non-evangelical philosophers and pedagogues. Under the second, or *Anthropological* principle, the Christian doctrine of depravity is reconciled with the childhood innocency and educability postulated by pedagogical science; while under the third, or *Methodical* principle, along with wisdom and natural educative talent, the absolute indispensability of prayer, faith, and answering divine blessing is earnestly insisted upon, and that on strictly scientific grounds. These three principles, namely, that education is *to* God, *from* a state of natural sinfulness and corruption, *by means of* the divine blessing upon endeavors made in prayer and faith—constitute the groundwork of the whole system. On this basis the author proceeds to elaborate the true principles, first, of training, and second, of instruction. These two sections, filling more than two hundred pages, he designates respectively the Discipline of Love and the Discipline of Truth. His own summary of their contents will give some idea of the important subjects therein discussed. "A. Relation to the Animal Life; B. Play; C. Moral Life. 1. Piety and the Fear of God. 2. Society, (Parents, Brothers and Sisters, Domestics, Playmates, Society and Church.) 3. The World, (Patriotic Education, Social Life, Art, Nature, Earthly Calling.) 4. Relation of the Child to itself, (Frivolity, Sense of Honor, Modesty, Self-education, Differences occasioned by Sex, the Means of all Love-discipline, Word, Self-Manifestation, Reward, and Punishment.") Second section: "Selection of the Material for Instruction; Preparation of the Child for Learning; Preparation of the Material to be Learned for the Child; The Process of Teaching and Learning." We regret that we have not space to describe in detail the contents of the second and third parts, and to reproduce some of the results of the author's interesting investigations. We can only recommend the interested to procure and study the entire work. Though prepared with immediate reference to Germany, where the relation of the school to the Church is entirely different from what it is in the United States, its study would prove exceedingly profitable to all who are endeavoring to resist the efforts of those infidel legislators and pedagogues who are seeking to rob our public schools of the last vestige of Christian character.

We would add that this work, the edition of Bengel's "Gnomon" below noticed, as also all the works issued by Mr. Steinkopf, of Stuttgart, can be obtained of Messrs. Schaefer & Koradi, Philadelphia.

Luther's Ringen mit den Antichristlichen Principien der Revolution. Von Dr. Heinrich Vorreiter. 8vo., pp. 418. Halle.

This is the title of a recent work written in the interest of toryism and high "Churchianity." The author's theory is that Luther was divinely called to *reform* the Church, but that, while comprehending his call, he shrank from it, and so far yielded to revolutionary tendencies as to better deserve the name of a Revolutionist than that of a Reformer. Despairing of his ability to regenerate the Church in its unity, he rent it in pieces, and endeavored to save only individuals or at most factions. That was his fatal blunder, and Christendom is to this day suffering its wretched consequences. He forgot the collective guilt of the Church, and sank to a mere polemizer against the Pope as "Antichrist." In his closing prayer the author seems to throw the whole blame of the existing schism between Catholics and Protestants upon the latter, and to profess his anxiety to hasten back to the bosom of the true Church. He says: "Would that we evangelicals might cease from our incessant self-apologizing, that we may not render permanent the retrogression of the Reformation and the body of our blessed Lord, his Church, longer suffer the pains of perpetual laceration. This may God work." The essay presents a curious mixture of truth and error, but has its value in presenting us with a view of Luther and the Reformation from a new stand-point.

D. Joh. Alberti Bengelii Gnomon Novi Testamenti, in quo ex nativâ verborum vi simplicitas, profunditas, concinnitas, salubritas sensuum coelestium indicatur. (Editio tertia, 1773, per filium superstitem. M. Ernestum Bengelium, quondam curata quinto recusa adjuvante. Johanna Steudel, cumantoris effigie. Stuttgartiæ, 1860. Sumtibus: J. F. Steinkopf.)

After the repeated notices of Bengel's "Gnomon" in these pages, (see the volume for 1862, p. 694; and 1861, p. 166,) it is needless to add new commendations. We simply wish to here call the attention of the student to a remarkably cheap, compact, yet complete and well-printed edition of the original Latin work. It is decidedly the best extant, accurate, readable, adorned with the likeness of Bengel, and yet sold at the low price of two thalers and twelve silver groschen, (less than two dollars in our currency.) Considering the fact that the Edinburgh version is notoriously poor, and that the new one of Professors Lewis and Vincent is expurgated, revised, and supplemented, with a view to rendering the work better adapted to the popular necessities of the present day, we doubt not that many will prefer an accurate and complete copy of the original. This new Stuttgart reprint offers everything that they can reasonably desire.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. 8vo., pp. 631. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

This work is intended by its author as a completion of his treatise upon Human Physiology; the one dealing with man's interior structure as an individual organism, the latter with collective man in the social organism. His doctrine is, that while volitional freedom is a truth, human history is ruled by law. "Social advancement is as completely under the control of natural law as is bodily growth." "In a world composed of vanishing forms," he says, "I am to vindicate the imperishability, the majesty of law, and to show how man proceeds in his social march, in obedience to it. I am to lead my reader, perhaps in a reluctant path, from the outward phantasmagorial illusions which surround us, and so ostentatiously obtrude themselves on our attention, to something that lies in silence and strength behind. I am to draw his thoughts from the tangible to the invisible, from the limited to the universal, from the changeable to the invariable, from the transitory to the eternal; from the expedients and volitions so largely amusing the life of man, to the predestined and resistless issuing from the fiat of God." It will be seen from this, and from other passages in both the author's treatises, that his stand-point is not pantheistic, but theistic. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, expressed with a glow of natural eloquence in his first publication, stands unretracted in this. The key to the science of history, in his view, is the great principle advanced by Pascal, "The entire succession of men, through the whole course of ages, must be regarded as one man, always living and incessantly learning." In accordance with this formula the author propounds the following programme of his work: "The intellectual progress of Europe being of a nature answering to that observed in the case of Greece, and this, in its turn, being like that of an individual, we may conveniently separate it into arbitrary periods, sufficiently distinct from one another, though imperceptibly merging into each other. To these successive periods I shall give the titles of, 1, The Age of Credulity; 2, The Age of Inquiry; 3, The Age of Faith; 4, The Age of Reason; 5, The Age of Decrepitude; and shall use these designations in the division of my subject in its several chapters."

If the idea of the conformity of European advancement to the progress of individual life be used as a convenient plan for grouping the ages of European development according to a graceful

analogy, it is a very pleasant contrivance. But if it be laid down as a scientific principle, it is only a truthlike phantasy, very much of the same class with the half-poetic, half-scientific whimseys engendered in what the author is pleased to call the "decrepitude" of the Grecian mind. It is discovering elephants in the clouds, or predicting fortunes in the fancy figures of the remnant leaves of your emptied tea-cup. The theory is upon a par with M. Comte's division of human development into three ages, and is demolished by the same refutations. Nations rise and fall equally by slow degrees, and by abrupt events. They are sometimes passing through alternations of advancement and decline; at other times they stand stationary through ages. In Europe these alternations of progress and regress do afford, on the scale of full millenniums, a clear demonstration of total progress. Asia on the other hand, and Africa, have lain during all those millenniums in semi-civilized or barbarous stagnation. What proof is there in either of these latter two continents that races or nations pass through stages analogous to the evolutions of an individual human life? A comparative glance at their maps, and at a chart of their histories, so far as they have history, is a finishing contradiction to the flimsy theory.

If the theory be true and scientific in regard to European civilization, we are in bad case. The "Age of Reason" is hard upon us; we are rapidly and forever sloughing off the remnant of faith and approximating the "decrepitude" that precedes social dissolution. Should not something be done to arrest the progress of this fatal civilization? Alas, it is hopeless! Inexorable "law" ascertains our doom. Like good Turks, we may as well sit still and await the plague or the decay written in the book of fate.

What are the true causes of progress and regress in the history of different parts of our race may be a subject of useful inquiry. Conducted in a method of searching analysis and comprehensive induction, it might yield fruits. This might ultimately yield a "Philosophy of History." There are certain conditions of a public, both subjective and objective, which conduce to progress; there are others that reverse this result. Why is it that one nation advances, another recedes, and another is stationary? Why is it that the same nation is sometimes at different periods in each of these conditions? What are those conditions? We find no solution of those problems in this work, and no track pointing to the solution. The entire method seems to us *à priori*, and the detail of facts selected partly as fancy pleased, and partly with an eye to prepare a conclusion. We have neither legitimate science nor legitimate history, but history cast into the mould of a theory.

Dr. Draper's view of Old Testament authority appears by the following passage: "Our current chronology was the offspring of erroneous theological considerations, the nature of which required not only a short historical term for the various nations of antiquity, but even for the existence of man upon the globe. This necessity appears to have been chiefly experienced in the attempt to exalt certain facts in the history of the Hebrews from their subordinate position in human affairs, and, indeed, to give the whole of that history an exaggerated value. This was done in a double way: by elevating Hebrew history from its true grade, and depreciating or falsifying that of other nations."—P. 146. To a writer who thus prefers Eratosthenes and the Egyptologists to Moses, we recommend a slight study of Sir Cornwall Lewis.

Coming to the Christian era, the author gives warning that offense may be taken at his truthful freedom. "Together we must trace out the progress of Christianity, examine the adaptation of its cardinal principles to the wants of the empire, and the variations it exhibited—a task supremely difficult, for even *sincerity and truth will sometimes offend.* For my part, it is my intention to speak with *veneration* on this great topic, and yet with liberty, for *freedom of thought and expression is to me the first of all earthly things.*"—P. 197. For our own part we have no intention to lose our equanimity at any sincere utterance by our author; but we must claim the same prerogative of sincere and truthful freedom. The history of Christianity itself, then, whatever may be the subjective position of the author personally, appears to us as deistical as the Decline and Fall by Edward Gibbon. We find no acknowledgment of the divine miraculous origin in this work as explicit as we can find in Gibbon. Our author first shows from the condition of effete Paganism and the confident dogmas of Christianity how naturally and necessarily the latter conquered. He divides early Christianity into dogma and organization. The dogmas of early Christianity were Judaic, Gnostic, and African. Of these the first soon perished; the second forms a much larger share of our present orthodox Christianity than is commonly supposed; but the third is still in full sway. "It cannot be said that Europe owes its existing forms of Christianity to a Roman origin. It is indebted to Africa for them. We live under African domination."—P. 215. Such being the character of existing Christian doctrine, what is to be said of early Christian "organization?" Its triumph is symbolized in the murder of Hypatia by Bishop Cyril, of which a rhetorical picture is presented as an instance in which "great general principles embody themselves in individuals."

We need of course trace this sort of history of Christianity no further. We but perform our duty in saying of it as a whole that it is not written in the spirit of Milman, Neander, Gieseler, or Guizot. The apparent spirit of the cold-souled Gibbon, without the splendor of Gibbon's eloquence, pervades the vast area of the dreary pages. If this should "offend," we have only to say that "freedom of thought and expression is the first of all earthly things."

Geographical Studies. By the late Professor CARL RITTER, of Berlin. Translated from the Original German, by WILLIAM LEONHARD GAGE, Translator and Editor of Professor Heinrich Steffen's "Story of my Career," etc. 12mo., pp. 356. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1863.

Mr. Gage enjoyed the rare advantage of having been Ritter's pupil, and has a fair prescriptive right as well as the ample ability to represent him to the American reader. Ritter was the great compeer of Humboldt in giving to the science of Geography its re-instauration on a new basis. It was a significant era when the first navigator sailed round the world. It was a wonderful illustration of the immeasurable superiority of human intellect over brute faculties when the savan first comprehended the round globe as a unit, and commenced to evolve a world of philosophy from the comparative survey of its parts. It then takes a stubborn skepticism to prevent your viewing the globe as a nice apple in God's hand. To Humboldt, alas! that cold skepticism belonged; but the heart of Ritter glowed with the rich piety his theme was calculated to awaken. The biography of the man, as given by Mr. Gage, is by no means the least interesting part of the book.

Ritter was born in 1779, published the first edition of his great work in 1817, became Professor of Geography at Berlin in 1820, and died in 1859. His great work, the Erdekund; or, Science of the Earth, is the fountain from which the Physical Geography, so wisely of late introduced into our schools, has emanated. The present volume, translated by Mr. Gage, has something of the defect which he indicates. Like the arc of a stupendous circle, it shows the *bent* of something grand without bringing much of the whole within our grasp. Yet to thoughtful minds it is truly a suggestive book, and we trust the translator will derive no discouragement from the results.

From his interesting biographical sketch we extract the following pleasing account of Ritter as a Professor:

When he came to Berlin in 1820, and announced in the University his lectures on Universal Geography, there were no hearers at the opening of the course, very few at the close, and but a handful in the following course. Yet still there was a

gain; and ever on went his success, till in 1823, only three years from the beginning of his labors as professor in Berlin, he wrote in his diary: "Full lecture-room; I must have a larger." And so it went on, till the largest hall in the University could hardly contain his pupils. It soon began to be "the thing" to hear Ritter, and nearly every student of the natural sciences was a daily attendant on his course. When I was in Berlin, five years ago, Ritter's room was still full; more than three hundred young men were hearing his lectures. He knew his art well. With almost womanly tact, he seized upon those features which present circumstances made interesting, and culled out of the immense masses of matter lying in his mind just what he could use with the greatest profit. He illustrated freely by excellent maps, and was a master in the use of the blackboard, sketching gracefully and readily whatever made his subject clear. I shall not forget the patriarchal appearance of Carl Ritter in the lecture-room in 1855. He used his notes about half the time, but read them easily, and with great distinctness. Obscure and involved almost without parallel in his written dissertations, yet his style was simple in the lecture-room, and his clear articulation and well-chosen emphasis, combined in a highly musical voice, made it easy to follow him. He was a tall, finely proportioned man, with a noble head, a most sincere and earnest manner, yet unusually quiet and simple. His dress was peculiar when an old man, and no one who frequented the famous Linden Avenue of Berlin would fail to remark that tall and venerable figure, clad in a long blue cloak and broad-rimmed hat, both half a century out of date. He used to wear a large rolling collar, like that worn by a past generation of New England grandfathers; and that, together with the huge horn spectacles, gave him a rusticity of appearance, and a simple friendliness, which captivated every one who knew his learning, his talents, and his heart. It was a characteristic of Ritter, that the external man was so penetrated by his inner nature that the two were inseparable and undistinguishable. He was such a one that if you had looked upon his face you had read the whole man; and therefore he belonged to that class of minds which always make the same impression upon men of all conditions and mental varieties. The cause of this uniform impression is found in his natural humility, in the quiet peacefulness of his inner life, which was more than mere tranquillity: it was the holy calmness of a Christian.—P. 27.

Ritter as a Christian:

He was one of the foremost Christians in Germany. He cherished from his schooldays a living faith in God and Christ, which the loss of his wife, twenty years before his own death, only strengthened. He was a Christian in the full sense of the word. He was a man who *spoke* little of faith; but it lay deeply at his heart, and showed itself in his active co-operation in the great Christian enterprises of the day. He was one of the most active men in Germany in promoting church harmony; and when the Evangelical Alliance met in Berlin three years ago, Ritter was one of the greatest voices there. He was steadfastly opposed to all forms of strife in the Church; but he cherished, as the chief joy of his life, his faith in Christ and the grace which God had implanted in his heart. God's word was the light of his steps; and it was the great end of all his scientific labors to confirm the truth of the Bible. Hoffman, his pastor, the eminent cathedral preacher of Berlin, uses these words in his address over Ritter's grave: "No one who lived in near intimacy with him will forget the bright glance of his eye when the richness of God's grace was spoken of, nor that serious earnestness of his with which he traced the hand of the eternal in his works; no one will forget that venerable head and that reverential face, as he sat in the house of God during the hour of afternoon worship, nor the few but precious words with which he proclaimed his peace in God through Jesus Christ, and expressed his hope of future glory. No one could approach him without feeling that the richness and vastness of his knowledge were all subordinate to a desire for His praise, by whom, and through whom, and for whom all things have been created. The blessing of the meek was plainly his, and no one could be with him even for a season and not feel it to be so; for he would note the universal peace of Ritter's soul, and the humility of his nature, pictured in every feature of his countenance."—P. 29.

Religion in his science:

Ritter carried his religion into his scientific studies. This earth was to him not a mere dwelling-place for nations; it was the material out of which life is woven; it was the garment in which the soul clothes itself, the body wherein the spirit formed by God must move. This was Ritter's central thought; all his ideas illustrated, all his researches confirmed it; through the earth as his way he reached God as his goal. The globe was to him but the place where God's kingdom should be founded; and in all his study of man, Christ became the middle point. In his most valuable scientific writings the thought that underlies them all—whether his subject be mountain heights or dark valleys, heaths or cities—is, that everything in the world comes from the counsels of God, and has a relation to the kingdom of Christ. This is the secret of those impressions which his geographical writings produce.—P. 30.

Ritter's written style:

As for beauty of style he had none of it. He fully illustrates the truth of what has been said by an eminent living writer: "The great German authors address themselves not to their country, but to one another. They are sure of a select and learned audience, and they use what is in fact a learned language; they turn their mother tongue into a dialect, eloquent indeed and very powerful, but so difficult, so subtle, and so full of complicated inversions, that to their own lower classes it is entirely incomprehensible."—P. v, Preface.

The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation. By Sir CHARLES LYELL, F.R.S., author of "Principles of Geology," "Elements of Geology." Illustrated by Wood-cuts. Second American from the last London Edition. 8vo., pp. 526. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1863.

In his celebrated treatise entitled "Principles of Geology," published some years ago, Sir Charles Lyell did a great work in establishing in the science of Geology the assumption that no causes were needed in order to account for all the physical changes in the structure of our earth than are now patent, provided the element of time can be assumed to any requisite amount. A large part of the treatise, embodying a history of Geology, traced with much detail, but great calmness, the obstacles met by the advances of Geology from the prepossessions and opposition of Theology. It closed with an extended refutation of Lamarck's theory of development, avowing that for the introduction of man upon the earth, which science showed to have taken place, science had no solution to offer. He could not explicitly accept the fact of immediate creation on the authority of the Hebrew records, as of those documents science could take no cognizance. But he left it to anybody who pleased to supplement the silence of science by such theory or history as they preferred. Science, in Sir Charles Lyell's hands, can know no Bible, no creation, and no God.

We do not say that individually Sir Charles Lyell is either a deist, a pantheist, or an atheist. He is personally, for aught we know, a devout Christian. We only say that in his hands science is pantheistic; just as in the hands of Strauss or Renan or David-

son biblical criticism is pantheistic. In the present volume (page 421) Sir Charles says: "Hitherto no rival hypothesis has been proposed as a substitute for the doctrine of transmutation; for 'independent creation,' as it is often termed, or the direct intervention of the Supreme Cause, must simply be considered as an avowal that we deem the question to lie beyond the domain of science." Just as explicitly Prof. Huxley says: "At the present moment but one such process of physical causation has any evidence in its favor; or, in other words, there is but one hypothesis regarding the origin of species of animals in general which has any scientific existence—that propounded by Mr. Darwin." So that, although geological science can listen to the story of any digger of stones in Abbeville, or any historical record of a past transaction, a suggestion of "independent creation" cannot reach the scientific ear. If the matter stopped at this point the offense would not be so very aggravated. The physicist might then be understood to say, "We recognize independent creation as a truth or a probability beyond the boundary lines of our science, and so hold all counter theories in abeyance until they bring an evidence sufficiently strong to falsify that supposed truth; for it is one thing to be out of the bounds of our one science, and other thing to be out of the bounds of reality." The truth may, in the divisions of knowledge, be cut off from geology; and it cannot be accepted as a part of geology. But when the geologist, after ignoring it as no part of geology, proceeds to inaugurate a theory into a science, on the assumption that no counter view has any existence, and holds the theory valid in default of all counter view, he has no right to expect the concurrence of any man who is anything more than a geologist. If Sir Charles Lyell or Prof. Huxley has no eyes or ears to cognize a non-geological fact, all the rest of the world has. We will allow them to exclude "independent creation" out of their geology; but, thanks be to God! they cannot exclude it from the domains of truth, any more than they can exclude God from his universe.

The present volume possesses great value for not only the savan, but the enlightened inquirer into the deeply interesting problem it discusses. There is a full detail of all the facts bearing upon the question of the "fossil man." The *illustrations* are of great value as furnishing the reader clear views of the various localities and objects so frequently named in the discussion. The work closes with some interesting remarks on the moral bearings of the doctrine of development indorsed by the author. The author supposes a point of advancement, in which the being becomes man by mounting to an immortal nature—somewhat as a rare genius, like Milton or Newton,

overtops the level of his race. Natural Theology he holds to remain undisturbed. Materialism is rather counteracted than confirmed. Of the Scripture record he seems to be scientifically ignorant. Should Sir Charles Lyell's book survive some great wreck of the literature of the age, it might be quoted in a future generation as a negative demonstration of the non-existence of the Pentateuch. We say not that the author is a pantheist; but we say that geology in his hands is science according to pantheism.

The book is done up by Mr. Childs in a style worthy its high reputation.

The Great Stone Book of Nature. By DAVID THOMAS ANSTED, M. A., Late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. 12mo., pp. 335. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1863.

You have never studied, you have no time to study, you have not the nerve required to study, Geology; but if you could only be beguiled into the science by mere easy fascinating *reading*, you would like it. Very well. One of the most accomplished savans here takes you by the hand, cheats you out of your fatigue, shows you by what route to approach, and in what manner to gain possession of this most interesting department of knowledge, in so graceful, semi-poetical, and pictorial a way that you will have taken a tinge of geology for all the rest of your life by spontaneous absorption.

In the first few chapters Mr. Anstead shows that the causes are now going on by which all the changes of the past have been effected. He then traces the forms, objects, and events which those causes have produced. The organic remains, the stores of fuel, the pre-Adamite world, the glittering treasures, the metallic wealth, and the circulation of water, form a train of topics more wonderful than romance and yet true. Why need we pore over Dickens and Owen Meredith when we can obtain Ansted? The typography and engravings are done up by Mr. Childs in a style worthy the work.

A Class-Book of Chemistry, in which the latest Facts and Principles of the Science are Explained, and Applied to the Arts of Life and the Phenomena of Nature. Designed for the Use of Colleges and Schools. A new edition entirely rewritten. With over three hundred illustrations. By EDWARD L. YOUMANS, M.D., author of the "Chemical Chart," "Chemical Atlas," "Handbook of Household Science," etc. 12mo., pp. 460. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863.

The present volume exhibits plentiful traits of what we believe we have before called Professor Youman's educational genius. It consists very much in a singular power of clear, concise expression,

lucid order, and an inventive skill in presenting intricate science in graphic form before the eye. The non-professional examiner of the work will find that if he does not keep well posted in the science it will fast grow out of his knowledge, its growth being as rapid and its magnitude being as unfinished as those of our own city of Gotham in past years.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Life and Times of Nathan Bangs, D.D. By Abel Stevens, LL.D., author of "The History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century, called Methodism. 12mo., pp. 426. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1863.

The selection of Dr. Stevens by Dr. Bangs as his biographer was a guarantee of a valuable addition to our historical literature. What we have to say of a favorable nature we premise with a disposal of points on which we dissent. The note in our last number indicating such a treatment in the work of the slavery question as would render the book capable of acceptance by all is not to be construed into an indorsement of Dr. Stevens's exhibit of that part of his subject. There is scarce a paragraph in those portions of his book which we could adopt as our own. And in the general his view seems to be that it was simply a sad strife in which the movers were the aggressors, and both sides wrong; by which Churches were disturbed and broken up, and in which moderateism was the great merit. Our view is that the movers were right; that with a high unsilenceable moral purpose they assailed an evil which the good of humanity required to be assailed; that there would have been little strife had there been, as there should have been, a reasonable concurrence instead of a reasonless opposition; and that therefore the assailants of the movers were the responsible aggressors and the "conservatives" were the destructives. That this view places a most brilliant dynasty of statesmen and churchmen in the shady side of history, that the "great men" of the crisis were great failures, that they were unable to comprehend or to rise to the high level of their moral position, is a fact which in every revolving year will become more clearly seen and more articulately pronounced.

The long life of Dr. Bangs stretched, like a historic line, from the present day far back into *our* primitive antiquity. He was at the beginnings of things. The seminal period of his birth, conversion, and early ministry seem like a gray twilight. Methodism in America was without form and void. The local religious movement in which he started into religious action is like one of the million spontaneous springs which form from all directions into a Mississippi.

And in the successive steps of organic formation he is present and working. The epochs of Methodism are notches in his personal history. And of all the institutes which have constituted her system no one character so forms the nucleus. Energetic, staid, progressive, and true, he was a co-operator, a leader, a princeps, until he became, by easy consent of all, the patriarch. Few men have we known for whom, in his patriarchal period, the epithet *venerable* seemed more purposely made.

He was a statesman and a warrior. Nor was he quite what he appears to be in Dr. Stevens's history, the meek evader of strife, who had a right to mourn in innocence over the polemic spirit of others. He was full ready for battle, could say unsparing things, and employ what appeared to his opponents very questionable tactics. Like Dr. Johnson, if his argumentative pistol missed fire he could knock the recusant down with the butt end. He had great ends in view, was autocratic in their pursuit, and repressed opposition in an unceremonious style. But in the great outline of his course his ends were public ends; he labored for the good of the Church and the world; he employed his great powers with a rare, consistent, and persistent faithfulness in the cause of his divine Master.

The two great errors of position in his life (of which Dr. Stevens gives no very explicit narrative) were his opposition to the temperance organizations and to the antislavery movement. In the first, his purpose was to hold aloof from the movement on the grounds that our Church was itself a temperance organization. After a period, however, so unanimous was the Church in its favor that he abandoned that position and entered frankly and fully into the spirit of that great beneficent work. This was doubtless a sincere change of opinion, and the unreserved decision with which it was made is a characteristic and honorable trait of his personal history; yet very sad it is that that same trait did not retrieve his false position in the latter great reform. His second error was like unto his first, springing much from a similar source, his confidence in the traditional antislaveryism of Methodism. He refused to see that that tradition had lost its sufficiency to meet the trials of a new state of things. It was liable to become an evil; serving as a voucher for one's antislaveryism preparatory to opening an onslaught upon all opposition to slavery. Regulated by such antecedents and surrounded by malign influences, he saw himself deserted by section after section of the Church, which refused equally to accept his counsels or to withhold her reverence for his memorable past and venerable present. Even while he stood in our conference, uttering those words that fell like icicles on the heart of the

Church to be applauded to the echo in Louisiana, she rejected his counsels with sorrow for their import, yet reverence for the utterer.

To the last, when he came into the arena, he maintained his ascendency. To the last the antislavery progressives, most of them comparatively young and inexperienced, dreaded his speeches and tactics more than those of all the others put together. He placed himself by natural ascendency at the head of the ranks, and his logic was as clear, his voice as piercing, his hand as heavy, and his management as skillful as in his palmy days. Little as there was of the mere showy or the effeminate in his manly style of oratory, it was at the close of one of his last efforts that we overheard a lady utter the words, "I *do* like to hear Dr. Bangs speak; it is so right to the point."

The true substantial popularity of Dr. Bangs with New York Methodism for thirty or forty years was eminently honorable to both parties. He purchased it by no flourish, no insinuating style of manners, no flimsy rhetoric, no rich imagination, no personal adulation, no finesse or intrigue. He stood in his own manly simplicity; he spoke in a style of clear, plain, solid English; his appeals, stern or gentle, were to the best reason of his hearers, and his deportment was that of a grave, thoughtful Christian gentleman. As such he was accepted and sustained by our Metropolitan Methodism through the great share of his long and valuable life. A body of Christian laity appreciated his comprehensive projects, contributed the means, and shared in the noble labors. The monuments of his useful toils and the remembrancers of his many and great virtues, are around us. May they long stand to accomplish the work for which he sought to found them and fully to perpetuate the earthly register of his name whose truest record is on high.

If we have touched all the more fully upon some points because we think that by omissions scarce true to history they are not represented by his biographer, let it be remembered that they are but few and isolated points. Of the great body of the volume, as well as the life of its eminent subject, we may speak with no qualified commendation. Dr. Stevens's name, as already indicated, is a pledge that a volume rich in historical, moral, and literary interest is ready for a wide class of expectant readers.

Outposts of Zion, with Limnings of Missionary Life. By Rev. William H. Goode, ten years a member of Frontier Conferences. 12mo., pp. 464. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1863.

Mr. Goode's successive fields of labor have been in Arkansas, Kansas, Nebraska, and the mining regions of the Rocky Mount-

nins. The ten years have stretched through a period of momentous history. Under the Church, previous to the separation, he held his center in Fort Coffee, where a prosperous missionary seminary was established, and supervised the Arkansas mission work. He was present at the Louisville Convention, where the pro-slavery Methodist Episcopal Church was inaugurated, and his details are painfully interesting. His exploring tour to the Rocky Mountains abounds in interest, and his conclusions in value. Right earnestly and justly does our faithful missionary plead the cause of our red American brethren. He scouts with benevolent indignation the cruel cant that the "Indian is doomed." He shows conclusively that where the speculator and the shark are excluded, and the missionary and the schoolmaster are allowed to do their work, moral elevation, increase of population, civilization, and ultimate rescue from annihilation are the blessed results. We are struck with the bold and noble proposition which closes the programme of dealing with the Indians, that they be educated and trained to become states in our Confederacy. Slavery and the slave-power, inhuman in all directions, have not forgotten to be cruel to the sons of the forest. Slavery has sustained and intensified the bigotry of race; pro-slavery administrations have sent unprincipled harpies to the territories to reap the reward of partisan services. Thus the three races, white, red, and black, have come under the destructive power of this common curse. Let us hope that a better day dawns. The great crime of two centuries abolished and expiated with tears and blood, let us hope that Japhet, Shem, and Ham—the Caucasian, the Indian, and the African—will recognize a common brotherhood, and cultivate peace, equity, and piety together. We feel like nominating "honest Abe" for one more term, vexed as we sometimes are at his inaptitude for rapid development, that he may be the emancipator of the three races—a tri-colored Liberator. Let him be permitted and willing to inaugurate a humane policy for the Indian, looking to the establishment of free, coequal states of that race, and future generations will call him *the* GOOD *President.*

The History of the Romans under the Empire. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. From the fourth London Edition. With a copious Analytical Index. Vol. i. 12mo., pp. 439. New York: Appleton & Co. 1863.

Merivale has been accepted by the highest English authorities as a *classic;* as a worthy member of the modern school of historians, which has shed so bright a luster on that department of English literature. His works covers the vacant interval in Roman history

between Arnold and Gibbon. It is at the same time the most stirring time, the most momentous epoch, in the history of that extraordinary nation. It commences at the formation of the first Triumvirate, and closes at the death of Marcus Aurelius. The first two volumes terminate at the close of the career of Julius Cesar, and are, in fact, the "life and times" of that, as Merivale thinks, "greatest character in history." It is the period of Pompey, Cato, Cicero, and Crassus. Volumes third and fourth extend to Claudius, including the Christian era. The sixth terminates at the fall of Jerusalem, and the seventh closes the work, A. D. 70, at the death of Aurelius. Its finish of style, its great success in bringing the enlightened judgment of modern thought to bear upon ancient events and characters, its descriptive and narrative power and thorough erudition, render it a worthy complement to the two great English historians of Rome, between whom it stands. Both the classic scholar and the general reader will rejoice to receive this work done up in the Appleton style.

The Life and Times of John Huss; or, the Bohemian Reformation of the Fifteenth Century. By E. H. Gillett. In two volumes. 8vo., pp. 632, 651. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1863.

Brief space compels us to use strong words to do commensurate justice to this noble work. It appears to us an honor to American scholarship and talent. It selects one of the truest, noblest, purest martyrs of the entire Christian history; it scatters the shades which historical neglect has allowed to gather around him; it draws from a thorough research into original and cotemporary sources, with graphic power, a living portrait of characters and events that possess an undying interest for every lover of purity, truth, and freedom. Mr. Gillett dates his preface from "Harlem, near New York city." Gould & Lincoln have worthily framed his historic pictures into two plain but stately volumes. Let not our religious and scholarly public overlook this production.

The Capital of the Tycoon: A Narrative of a Residence in Japan. By Sir Rutherford Alcock, K. C. B., His Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Japan. With Maps and Illustrations. In two volumes. 12mo., pp. 407, 436. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The opening of Japan to European incursion, which must ultimately completely Europeanize or Americanize that country, will render this a welcome book to a large class of inquirers. It is written in vigorous style, and its bountiful supply of maps and illustrations greatly aids in furnishing clear conceptions of that peculiar region and people.

Belles-Lettres and Classical.

Temptation and Triumph, with other Stories. By VIRGINIA F. TOWNSEND. 12mo., pp. 389. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1863.

This book belongs to the class in which the realities of life have crowded all interest from our individual mind, and which we usually huddle into our "miscellaneous" list of titles. But for those who feel the "aching void" for fiction, and desire that it may be supplied with aliment that will healthfully nourish the inner man, we recommend this as the right book, on the authority of the source from which it issues.

Periodicals.

The British American. A Monthly Magazine, devoted to Literature, Science, and Art. No. 7. Nov. 1863. 8vo., pp. 112. Toronto: Rollo & Adam.

We welcome to our Table every token that our Canadian brethren are prosecuting a career of intellectual advancement. Whatever our geographical boundary lines or political separations are, both belong to the REPUBLIC of Letters. It is of the very nature of a true democratic spirit to make any allowance for differences of positions and views; nor do we the less desire the prosperity of our Provincial neighbors because we prefer a President and they cherish a spirit of loyalty toward the noble Lady who now adorns with every womanly virtue the British throne. When the Prince of Wales rode up our Broadway, that street was spanned with the banner, "We honor the Mother and we welcome the Son." Never was a public tribute more spontaneous, less *gotten up*, than that ovation through our free states. Twice on our continent was the Prince insulted; once in Canada, and once, the moment he trod slave soil, in the streets of Richmond. How little did the American heart expect or realize that in a few short months, in response to all this, the British government would do all it dare against us and for the rebellious Confederacy of Richmond, and how madly the British press would open upon us its floodgates of insolence and calumny. To all this we have presented our Monitors and our defiance; we owe the moderation of these later days not to English justice or honor but to English discretion. They *would* but they *dare not*, and America will scarce forget it this half century. Yet we recognize the fact that the humble people are on our side. We shall not forget the heroism of the suffering artisans of Lancashire; we cherish the belief that the motherly heart of the British queen never has forgotten how

once these free states poured forth their love and honor on her son; and we yet hold fast the story that the hand of the dying Albert employed its failing energy in softening the words of the demand for reparation in the case of the Trent.

Our Canadian brother is of course very silly when he touches upon our affairs. He is greatly in fear that we shall lose our liberties. He considers us cursed with a "bridled press, a suspended *habeas corpus*, a threatened military despotism!" He may set his heart at ease. At the approaching close of Mr. Lincoln's term of office another presidential election will reinstate him, or supply a successor in his office, as our free Republic pleases. All the machinery of our Republican government will go on. Our free institutions will be just as intact as though no army had been raised and no *habeas corpus* suspended. His hopes or fears that our liberties will be impaired or our institutions unsettled, are as rational as some lunatic's panic lest the keel of the Great Eastern should cut the Atlantic in two and let the water out. The only institution that will disappear, if any, will be Slavery, and that will leave us a higher, purer freedom, and a perfected Union. The South will then commence her manufactures, and both sections will be unanimous for a tariff that will probably leave England the chance of being the consumer of our manufactures provided she be not too poor to buy. The hero-artisans of Lancashire we hope to import to a more congenial clime.

Besides some lighter literature the British American has an entertaining semi-scientific article on "Frogs and their Kin," and a valuable article by the editor, H. Y. Hind, on the Fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Labrador, and Newfoundland. The book notices are mostly of our Free State publications. Of Canadian periodicals are noticed "Transactions of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec," and "the Canadian Naturalist and Geologists." The latter contains an article on "The Air-breathers of the Coal Period," by Dr. Dawson, the able author of Archaia.

Miscellaneous.

An Outline of the Elements of the English Language, for the Use of Students. By N. G. Clark, Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in Union College. 12mo., pp. 220. New York: C. Scribner. 1863.

This little volume is not, as the title might seem to indicate, a grammar, but more properly a history of the English language. As such it is a valuable manual, written in a graceful style and ample mastery of the subject.

The Every-Day Philosopher in Town and Country. By the author of "The Recreations of a Country Parson." 12mo., pp. 320. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

The Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson. By the author of "The Recreations of a Country Parson." 12mo., pp. 307. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

Our old friend after ruralizing a while drew near to town, and after philosophizing through a long series of efforts at last *preaches*. That he is truly serious and in earnest in this last performance need not be doubted. If heretofore he has appeared secular and worldly-wise, yet let it be remembered he never once denied or doffed his gown. He told you at start that he was a "parson;" that though out of his pulpit and out of his homiletics, he was not out of his sacred calling. It was indeed week-day and not Sunday; and he talked matters of prudential morality rather than of religion. But the thoughts of diviner strain that take hold of eternity, of Christ and redemption, are but held in reserve.

The "Graver Thoughts" are *sermons*. They are in much the same pure, mellow, flowing style with the essays. They are not mere ethical lectures like the sermons of Blair. They contain searching appeals to the conscience, and explicit presentations of Christ as the atoning Saviour. "Many of these words," he tells us, "have been said to a little handful of kindly country people, and all of them to a large congregation of educated folk in a great city."

Daily Walk with Wise Men; or, Religious Exercises for Every Day in the Year. Selected, arranged, and adapted by Rev. NATHAN HEAD. 12mo., pp. 782. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861.

This is a book of devout readings for every day in the year, selected from Augustine, Calvin, Leighton, Chrysostom, Davenant, and a few others.

Man's Gift to God. A Discourse by ADOLPHE MONOD. Translated from the French by a Lady. 18mo., pp. 43. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1863.

About the most beautiful uninspired sermon we ever read: searching, philosophical, evangelical, and eloquent. It should have been done up in purple and gold.

Woman and her Saviour in Persia. By a Returned Missionary. With five Illustrations and a Map of the Nestorian Country. 12mo., pp. 303. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863.

A gem in Missionary literature.

Chrestomathie Française, a French Reading Book, containing, 1. Selections from the best French Writers with References to the Author's French Grammar. 2. The Masterpieces of Molieu, Racine, Boileau, and Voltaire. With Explanatory Notices and a Vocabulary. By WILLIAM J. KNAPP, A.M., Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in Madison University. 12mo., pp. 480. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

The Ring of Amasis. From the Papers of a German Physician. By ROBERT BULWER LYTTON. ("Owen Meredith.") 12mo., pp. 301. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

Peter Carradine; or, the Martindale Pastoral. By CAROLINE CHESEBRO. 12mo., pp. 398. New York: Sheldon & Co. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863.

The Mill Agent. By the author of "Opposite the Jail." 12mo., pp. 352. Boston: Graves & Young. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1864.

History of the Sioux War and Massacres of 1862 *and* 1863. By ISAAC V. D. HEARD. With Portraits and Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 354. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

The Yankee Boy at Home. 12mo., pp. 294. New York: James Miller, (successor to C. S. Francis & Co.) 1864.

Broken Columns. 12mo., pp. 558. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1863.

Notices of several books and pamphlets have been omitted or postponed for want of space.

Plan of Episcopal Visitation for February, March, and April, 1864.

Conference.	Place.	Time.	Bishop.
KENTUCKY	Augusta	February 25*	SIMPSON.
BALTIMORE	Wesley Chapel, Washington.	March 2	SCOTT.
EAST BALTIMORE	Altoona	" 2	JANES.
NEW JERSEY	Bridgeton	" 2	SIMPSON.
MISSOURI AND ARKANSAS	Jefferson City	" 2	BAKER.
PHILADELPHIA	Wilmington, Del.	" 9	AMES.
KANSAS	Leavenworth	" 10*	BAKER.
NEWARK	Market-street, Paterson	" 16	SIMPSON.
PITTSBURGH	Barnesville, Ohio	" 16	SCOTT.
WESTERN VIRGINIA	Parkersburgh	" 16	MORRIS.
PROVIDENCE	New London, Conn.	" 23	AMES.
WYOMING	Waverly, N. Y.	" 23	JANES.
NEBRASKA	Omaha City	" 24*	BAKER.
NEW ENGLAND	Walnut-street, Chelsea	" 30	AMES.
TROY	Amsterdam	" 30	SIMPSON.
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Lebanon	April 6	JANES.
ONEIDA	Norwich	" 6	SCOTT.
NORTH INDIANA	Knightstown	" 6	MORRIS.
NEW YORK	Newburgh	" 13	AMES.
NEW YORK EAST	Hartford	" 13	SIMPSON.
BLACK RIVER	Adams	" 13	BAKER.
VERMONT	St. Johnsbury	" 13	JANES.
MAINE	Wesley Church, Bath	" 14*	SCOTT.

* Thursday.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1864.

ART. I.—MORAL PHILOSOPHY OF WATSON'S INSTITUTES.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

MORAL PHILOSOPHY we have already ventured to define as *the Science of the Moral Law, and of the nature of man as the subject of moral law.*

In so doing we are claiming for the science a wider range than is usually assigned by ethical writers. Dr. Mahan, in his small but valuable work on Moral Philosophy, excludes from this field all questions as to the nature of man, remitting them to the department of pure psychology. "It belongs to the intellectual philosopher rather than to the moral philosopher to determine whether the elements necessary to moral agency exist in man."* Inasmuch, however, as a fundamental position of the doctor's philosophy, and, as we believe, of any true philosophy of morals is *that moral law exists in man, not only objectively, but subjectively*—his reason imposing rules for the government of his conduct so that "he is a law unto himself"—and inasmuch as this fundamental truth is denied by the sensational school, its consideration is demanded in a complete treatise of moral philosophy. We think, also, that such a treatise would be essentially defective if it did not discuss, not merely the question, "What are the elements of moral agency?" but also "Do the constituents of accountability exist in man?" A true philosophy of morals must be grounded upon a true

* "Moral Philosophy," pp. 21, 22.

philosophy of man. Moral law can only be predicated of a moral agent; that man *is* a moral agent must therefore be determined before we can consider the rules by which his conduct *ought* to be governed. What, then, are the essential conditions of moral agency? and, do these conditions exist in man?

A moral agent is a being who is accountable for his conduct.

The term "moral" can only be applied to the conduct of responsible beings, and "responsibility" expresses, in one word, the fact that a being is *capable* of giving an answer as to the reasons or motives of his conduct, and that he is *liable* to be called upon to give that answer.

We feel there is an utter incongruity in the application of this term to the necessary events of the universe, or the acts of unreasoning, brutal forms of sense. The elements may seem to lash themselves into unwonted fury; the sea may swallow up thousands in the surging, furious storm; the forked lightning and the wild tornado may carry desolation and death over large populations; the beasts of the forest may devour the helpless and the innocent; but no one would be so foolish as to characterize these acts and events as *immoral*, first, because the agents are not endowed with *intelligence* to apprehend a law of conduct, and secondly, because they do not *voluntarily* determine their own acts in view of such a law.

Here the distinction between *moral* and *physical* law comes fully into view. Physical law is the *rule* in conformity with which the physical and vital forces, and the organic appetencies of the universe, invariably operate. Moral law is the *rule* in conformity with which moral agents are required to act. Physical law relates to an event or act which is *necessary*. Moral law relates to an event or act which is *voluntary*. Physical law expresses a *causal* relation. Moral law expresses what *ought* to be, but which the agent, alone, determines *shall* or *shall* not be.

Now to affirm of any being that he *ought* to perform a particular act, implies not merely that it is in itself right, but also,

1. That the agent has INTELLIGENCE to perceive its inherent rightness, and to affirm obligation to comply with the demands of right.

2. That he has POWER or ability to do or not to do the thing required.

3. That he is susceptible of certain EMOTIONS which arise as the immediate consequence of his acts, and secure an adequate retribution. These, then, are the essential conditions of moral agency. The possession of a conscience and the ability to obey conscience are the subjective grounds of moral obligation.

All these conditions of accountability exist in man. By virtue of his constitution as a spiritual being, made in the image of God, he is capable of perceiving what is inherently right, just, and good. His *reason* intuitively apprehends the good, and necessarily affirms the imperative obligation to choose the good. His *judgment* pronounces upon the relation of human conduct to the law of right, affirming man has or has not done right. And his *emotive* nature yields him complacence and joy as the reward of well-doing, or inflicts pain and remorse as the punishment of wrong-doing. In the words of Chalmers, "he is endowed with a Conscience which performs within his bosom all the offices of a Lawgiver and a Judge."

The possession of this faculty necessarily supposes the existence of POWER in the agent to comply or not to comply with its behests. A moral law is designed only for the government of a free being. If there is no self-determination there is no proper personality to which the law of reason can attach. Remorse, on the one hand, satisfaction on the other, are emotions which are inconceivable, and impossible in a being who is not consciously free.

When once the fundamental canon of philosophy is generally admitted, *that the authority of consciousness is final as to the reality and validity of all knowledge of self*, then the philosophers and theologians of all schools must accord the FREEDOM OF THE WILL. We shall therefore remit all discussion on this point, being quite satisfied to wait until all men shall come, as they *must* soon come, to accept the voice of consciousness as an infallible guide; which on this, and, as we believe, on many other questions in philosophy, will be an end of all controversy.

The nature and authority of Conscience is still a question to be earnestly discussed. Among philosophers and theologians there are still diverse and conflicting opinions. It has been variously characterized as a *witness* of our past actions; as a

judgment passed upon our actions; or as a *feeling* arising in view of our actions. By one, conscience is regarded as an *appetite*—a craving for the right, but not a faculty intuitively perceiving the right. Another defines it "as a *capacity* and a *tendency* to inquire into duty, but not as supplying a law of duty."* While a third regards it as a state of the *sensibility*—"a simple feeling, emotion, or vivid sentiment which arises immediately in the mind in presence of certain actions and to which we give the name of moral approbation."† This seems to have been the opinion entertained by Watson. "Conscience cannot be considered as anything more than the general principle of moral approbation or disapprobation, nor can we think they have deserved well of morals or religion who have deduced our notions of right and wrong from any other principle."‡ We presume, however, he would not have the last remark applied to those who, with himself, derive our "notions of right and wrong" from oral revelation.

These definitions of conscience may all be regarded as containing some truth; a sound eclecticism may draw from them the materials of a doctrine of conscience which shall be a truer and fuller representation of all the facts of man's moral constitution. They are all defective, however, in this one respect, *they fail to recognize an internal law which constitutes a subjective standard of right*, and an intuitive perception of moral distinctions and qualities in human actions.§

As an essay toward that unity and general accord which must eventually arise as an achievement of moral science, we venture the following propositions, and attempt the following analysis of man's moral nature.

1. *Conscience is not a distinct faculty of the mind.* Conscience (conscientia=joint or double knowledge) is the knowledge of self, and the knowledge of self in relation to a known law of right and wrong. Conscience and consciousness may therefore be regarded as, in some respects, identical. The

* R. W. Hamilton. † Dr. Brown.

‡ Art. "Conscience," Theo. Dictionary.

§ It is deeply interesting to find the venerable Wesley on this, as on many other questions, in advance of his age, and in harmony with a truer philosophy. He defines "Conscience as a POWER or faculty implanted by God in every soul that comes into the world of *perceiving what is right and wrong.*"—Sermon xii, p. 102.

terms in their etymology and their general import are synonymous. There is, however, a technical distinction to be made. Consciousness expresses self-knowledge in general. Conscience expresses self-knowledge relative to responsibility. Consciousness is the recognition by the thinking subject of its own acts and affections. Conscience is the knowledge of an act or affection as having some moral quality—as being right or wrong.

2. *Conscience is the common field in which is revealed the operation of all our faculties in relation to moral law.* As consciousness is the common field of all our mental activities, so conscience is that department in which is revealed the operations of the mind in its relation to the eternal and unchangeable principles of order and right as they exist in the bosom of the Infinite. Conscience is the Godward side of our mental being which reflects the moral character of God, and brings us into relationship with him. It is that which carries man *per saltum* to the immediate recognition of a God—the Lawgiver and the Judge who is over man, and which holds him in mysterious, but indissoluble bonds of obligation. Conscience is, therefore,

(1.) *The* REASON *revealing universal moral ideas and laws.* It furnishes the *idea of the good.* It affirms that the good is universally *obligatory.* It asserts that the good has *desert*, worthiness, and dignity. And it demands for the good an appropriate *reward.*

(2.) The UNDERSTANDING apprehending the *relations* in which we stand to God, to our fellow-beings, and to self as a moral personality, endowed with reason, liberty, and immortality.

(3.) The JUDGMENT comparing the acts of a voluntary agent, existing in certain relations, with the ideas and laws of the reason, and affirming this is *right*, and worthy of praise and reward, or that is *wrong*, and deserving of blame and punishment.

(4.) *A particular direction of the* SENSIBILITIES—the painful or pleasurable emotions which naturally and spontaneously arise in presence of right or wrong in our own actions or the actions of other men.

Conscience organizes and holds together all these faculties of the soul in their immediate action in relation to responsible

conduct. *It is the unity of all our moral ideas, cognitions, judgments, and feelings.*

The co-operation of these faculties of the mind in their relation to the *good* has a parallel and an illustration in their action in relation to the *beautiful.*

The ideas of order, proportion, harmony, variety, and unity are unquestionable fundamental ideas of the *reason.* In the Divine Reason these ideas have always existed as the prototypes after which he fashioned the material universe. And inasmuch as the human reason is configured to the Divine, these ideas must also exist in the human mind. Like statuary in the inner palaces of the soul, they are the models by which we recognize, and the standards by which we judge of forms of beauty in the external world. The correspondence between these external forms and the fundamental ideas of the reason is recognized by the *judgment.* And the admiration and delight we experience in presence of the beautiful in nature and art is a particular direction of the *sensibilities.*

This is not, however, the chronological order in which the idea of the beautiful is developed in the mind. The *sense of beauty* first reveals itself in the spontaneous and universal consciousness in the presence of order, grace, proportion, and harmony in the material world. We are pleased without being able at once to characterize the precise cause of our pleasure. But the reflective consciousness brings out into clearer light and bolder relief the fundamental ideas of order, proportion, harmony, variety, and unity which had a prior existence in the mind, and have now recognized themselves as mirrored in the universe. The repeated contemplation of the forms of beauty around us, and the comparison of these forms with the standards erected in the human soul, will result in the beau ideal of a pure and correct taste—a true *αἰσθητικόν.*

So in relation to the *idea of the good.* It does not stand forth to the eye of consciousness, in the first instance, as an abstract conception. The *moral sense*—the affection of the sensibility in presence of voluntary and accountable action—is first revealed in the spontaneous and universal consciousness. When we behold an act of justice, of kindness, of beneficence, we experience the fullest satisfaction. We admire and esteem the actor. We feel that his conduct is praiseworthy, that he is

deserving of honor and reward. These sentiments spring up spontaneously in our bosoms long before we have defined their reason and law. The reflective consciousness subsequently elicits the ideas of reason which determine these emotions—the ideas of the useful, the truthful, the just, the beneficent, the noble, and the perfect. And the repeated comparison of the conduct of voluntary agents, existing under certain conditions and relations, with these fundamental ideas of reason, these standards of right erected in the human soul, will result in an ideal of moral excellence—a true ἐθικός.

If this theory of conscience be the enouncement of a true psychological method, it will enable us to account for the apparent want of uniformity in its suffrages in individual cases, and the varied phenomena it presents in different men.

The absence of proper discipline and culture in any one of the faculties which enter into the concrete phenomena will modify the general result. An excess of *sensibility* will give a morbid conscience; the lack of sensibility a slumbering conscience. A defective apprehension of the relations in which we stand to God and our fellow-beings will prevent our seeing our specific and immediate duties. Inattention to the character of our own motives, or ignorance of the real intentions of others, may mislead the *judgment* in discriminating between the quality of actions. There are also natural differences in the soundness and accuracy of the judgments of individual men. We meet those who, with a limited acquaintance with particular facts and abstract notions, are nevertheless endowed with a sound practical judgment; while others, with a larger knowledge of facts and general principles, are strangely defective in judgment. And, finally, unless men accustom themselves to some reflection, the ideas of the just, the right, and the good do not come clearly into the light of conscience. Hence the different manifestations of conscience in individual men.

We claim, however, that the moral ideas of the reason are in all men *identical;* that they exist, and operate, even though unconsciously, in all minds, determining their moral judgments on human conduct; and that, *when the same conditions are fulfilled, the affirmations of conscience in all moral agents are uniform.*

In pursuing our inquiry into the nature of man, as the subject of moral law, we have strictly adhered to the psychological method. If, following that method, we have attained to just views of the moral constitution of man, we are now prepared to offer some suggestions toward the construction of a *Science of Ethics* which shall embrace all duties, and be applicable to all the relations of human existence.

In order to our attaining a valid Science of Moral Law there are *two* essential conditions to be fulfilled.

1. *We must furnish an analysis of the moral ideas of reason.*

2. *We must ascertain the specific relations in which we stand to moral beings.*

The first will give the universal principles and laws in the light of which we may perceive the *determinate* duty. The second will give the *particular* forms of obligation arising out of the varied relations in which moral agents exist. The *general* principles and laws of right are thus divided into a number of *specific* duties by the relations in which we stand to other beings. The apprehension of our relationships to other beings is thus the grand middle term which unites the universal and immutable moral law to the real life of each individual man. When these relations are clearly apprehended, and when the universal principles and laws of the reason are fully evolved in the reflective consciousness, we have a valid science of the Moral Law. What, then, are the fundamental ideas of the reason? and what are the relations in which we exist?

I.—Fundamental Ideas of the Reason.

1. Beneath all moral judgments and moral sentiments philosophic analysis presents a primitive, fundamental idea which is the ground of the moral law, namely, the IDEA OF THE GOOD—τὸ ἀγαθόν—the absolute good. "The moral law, in so far as it is a norm for the will, is nothing more than *the good*, which, in an ethical system that follows the real order, must be deduced prior to and independent of it."*

2. Immediately reposing on the idea of the good is the IDEA OF DUTY OR OBLIGATION. The idea of the good now becomes to us an imperative rule of conduct. The reason affirms it, not simply as a law for ourselves, but also as a law which is binding

* Müller, "Christian Doctrine of Sin," vol. i, p. 29.

upon all intelligent beings. "Moral truths, in the eye of reason necessary, are to the will universally obligatory."* These two ideas, that of the good, and of obligation to will the good, are inseparable. They involve each other, and, together, fill up the complement of our idea of moral law. We know that an action is good by this criterion, "*that the motive, being generalized, appears to us a maxim of universal legislation.* If you are not able thus to generalize the motive of an action, and if it is the opposite motive which appears to you as a universal maxim, your action, being opposed to this maxim, is thereby proved to be contrary to reason and duty—it is bad."†

3. The IDEA OF MORAL DESERT is necessarily associated with the idea of the good. Apart from all reasoning, we intuitively perceive that the choice of the good has worthiness and merit. We cannot but approve it in ourselves and esteem it in others. We necessarily and spontaneously disapprove and condemn the opposite choice. We feel it has demerit and ill-desert.

4. Merit and demerit involve the IDEA OF RETRIBUTION. They demand a reward and a punishment. If virtue receive its appropriate reward and vice its merited punishment, we feel that moral order is sustained, the human reason is satisfied.

The idea of the good as obligatory, when contemplated relatively to human existence, appears as,

1. *The idea of the useful*, or the demand of reason that every being shall fulfill some valuable end.

2. *The idea of fitness*, or the demand of reason that we shall do that, and that alone, which is *becoming* and *worthy* a free, intelligent, spiritual, and immortal being, the imperatives of the spirit's own excellency and dignity.

3. *The idea of the truthful*, or the demand of reason that all representations in language and in act shall correspond with what is *real* and *true*.

4. *The idea of the just*, or the demand of reason that every being shall receive his *right* and *due;* that we shall esteem and treat all beings and objects according to their apprehended and relative worth.

* Cousin.

† Kant's "ingenuous standard," as stated by Cousin, p. 302, "The True, Beautiful, and Good."

5. *The idea of the beneficent*, or the demand of reason that we shall *will the good of being*, and labor to secure the happiness and promote the moral and social elevation of the race.

6. *The idea of the noble, the disinterested*, or the demand of reason that we shall prefer the just, the true, the good to all considerations of personal interest or pleasure.

7. *The idea of the perfect*, or the demand of reason that we shall aim to secure the full and harmonious development of all our powers.

These are the fundamental ideas and laws of the reason in the light of which we may perceive the determinative duty.

II. The Specific Relations we sustain to Moral Beings.

1. *A relation of Inherence.* (1) A moral personality—the reason and liberty which are in us, (2) a perfection which is possible to us, (3) an eternal future which is before us.

2. *A relation of Equality.* (1) In a common humanity, (2) in natural rights, (3) in a common worth and destiny.

3. *A relation of Reciprocity.* (1) By mutual interests and (2) by reciprocal influences, so that we are the constant sources of good or evil to each other.

4. *A relation of Community.* (1) By marriage, (2) by consanguinity, and (3) by agreement or covenant.

5. *A relation of Dependence.* (1) Of natural dependence upon our parents, (2) of contingent dependence on our neighbors, and (3) of absolute dependence upon God, the creator and preserver of men.

When a particular *relation* is before the mind, the judgment, in the light of the fundamental and necessary ideas of reason, affirms a particular obligation, a *specific duty* arising out of that relation. The sum of these moral judgments constitutes,

III. Practical Ethics.

Our space will allow only of a few brief suggestions toward the application of the foregoing principles to practical life. No Treatise on Ethics can possibly specify *all* the duties which arise in the varying circumstances and relations of our earthly existence. It can do no more than furnish the general princi-

ples and laws under the guidance of which *we* may for ourselves determine what is our duty in all circumstances and in all relations.

1. *We stand in constant relation with ourselves*, not with our individual existence merely, but with ourselves as endowed with reason and liberty, as having an end to fulfill in this life and a destination in a future life. We have therefore *duties toward ourselves.*

It will not be questioned that we are so endowed with reason and liberty as to constitute a moral personality. We have also within us the powers and possibilities of endless good, and we are destined to fulfill the noblest ends. It is therefore our duty to maintain *self-respect*, and act worthy of our spiritual dignity. We must also *educate* and *govern* ourselves. We must control our passions, discipline our will, cultivate our sensibilities, and secure the harmonious development and highest *perfection* of our intellectual and moral and spiritual being. We owe it to ourselves to fulfill the great ends of our being, to rise to the full measure of our capacity and destiny, and prepare ourselves for eternity.

2. *We stand in specific and definite relations to our fellow-beings*—relations of equality, of reciprocity, of community, and of dependence. *We have therefore duties to our fellow-beings.*

We are all partakers of a common nature; we have common rights, mutual interests, reciprocal influences for weal or woe, a common dignity and destiny. We are bound together by ties of household, and of relationships. We are dependent on each other for food, for medicine, for instruction, for defense, for the conveniences and elegancies of life.

It is therefore our duty to respect the *rights* of all, to render to all their *due*, and to esteem and treat all beings according to their inherent and real worth. We ought to lay our account with man in view of all the possibilities of his nature, and to set store upon him, not according to what he now is, but according to his true capacity and dignity—his unseen yet prophetic worth. The *good of universal being* must become to us the object of solicitude and effort. We must seek the moral perfection of the race. If there be one being less fortunate, less happy, less virtuous than ourselves, we are bound to strive

after his social and moral elevation. We must compassionate the miserable, we must relieve the destitute, we must instruct the ignorant, and, by all the means in our power, redeem the fallen.

Besides the general relation in which we stand to all men, there are particular relations in which we stand to individuals which involve particular duties. The parental relation gives rise to *parental* duties. The filial relation to *filial* duties. The conjugal relation to *conjugal* duties. The civil relation to *civil* duties. On these we cannot dwell. It is indeed beyond our design to exhibit all these particular duties, or mark their relation to the universal idea of the good. We merely offer the following general observations. The union of any number of rational beings, whether in the family or the state, involves the necessity of *government* as a means toward an end, namely, the *general good*. Government supposes *authority*. And the foundation of all authority, whether in the parent or the civil ruler, is the *relation of dependence*. "Whenever one being sustains such a relation to another that, without controlling him, he cannot do him the good which benevolence demands, the right and duty of control exists on the part of the former, and the duty of obedience on the part of the latter."* Parental requirements and civil enactments must, however, derive their real and permanent authority from *reason*—they must be conformable to the just, the true, the good. For a short season they may be sustained by mere power, but unless they echo the demands of the universal conscience they cannot long command respect or obedience; they will become effete, or be violently overthrown, because they are unjust and untrue. The only strong and enduring thing is the *right*. All relative duties, therefore, that carry an imperative obligation to all beings, in all times, will be found to be modifications of the fundamental ideas of reason.

3. *We stand in fixed and changeless relations to the Infinite.* We are absolutely dependent on God; we have therefore *duties toward him*.

There are three great facts of our inward consciousness which seem to underlie and determine our conception of piety toward God. (1.) A sense of utter *dependence* on God. (2.) A

* Mahan.

conviction of *accountability* to God. (3.) A *belief* in God as the Infinite and Perfect.

Toward him from whom our existence is derived, and on whom we continually depend for life and well-being, we are bound to cherish feelings of *gratitude* and *hope* and *trust.* The sense of accountability to him imposes the duty of making his law, in whatever way revealed, the rule of our conduct. God stands revealed to us *in* and *by* conscience as a moral governor commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong. This "voice within" has been universally recognized as the voice of God. The universal consciousness of our race, as revealed in history, clearly teaches that the commands of the moral faculty have always been immediately and spontaneously referred to an *external* authority. "The felt presence of a Lawgiver and a Judge within has always pointed to a Lawgiver and a Judge who is over us," and given the surest warning of a retribution which awaits us. Out of these inner facts of consciousness the outward acts of prayer and expiation have unquestionably been developed. "The sense of dependence is the instinct which in every age has urged men to pray."* And the consciousness of demerit and ill-desert has moved man to self-inflicted sufferings and costliest sacrifices to expiate sin.

God in his essential nature is a being of infinite *perfection.* All moral excellency resides in him. He is pure and holy, just and good. Toward such a being reason demands we shall cherish the highest moral esteem. It is our duty to reverence, love, and delight in him—to *worship* God. And such worship must tend to elevate and perfect man.

It only remains for us, in conclusion, to protest against the allegation that our method subverts the authority and dispenses with the necessity of Divine revelation. Such allegations are unworthy a serious refutation.

We affirm that our philosophy is in harmony with revelation, and places its authority on the broad and immovable basis of necessary and universal truth. It shows that "the law of the mind" and the statutes of the revealed code are *identical*—that the writing on the tables of stone, and the writing upon

* Mansel.

the hearts of men, are by the same finger of God. And when in the course of our inquiry we have found the foundation of moral obligation in the divine REASON rather than the divine will, we are persuaded the idea of duty is invested with increased sacredness and reality and force.

We think, also, that the *necessity* for a Divine revelation must be argued on higher and broader grounds than our *presumed* ignorance of what is right and good.

The great, the prevailing necessity for a divine revelation is to be found in our conscious guilt, which needs a voice from heaven to remove it; and our depravity of heart, which needs grace from on high to correct it, rather than in our inability to perceive the good. Amid the clamor and uproar of passion the voice of conscience is drowned. Beneath the outward conditions of human existence, the perverted tastes and evil customs of society, and the surrounding circumstantial darkness, the light of reason is obscured. Mankind are indisposed to calm reflection on moral questions, and the determinate duty cannot always be clearly reached by a series of deductions from universal ideas and laws. And when the knowledge of duty *is* attained, men are unwilling to obey its behest.

Revelation, therefore, is needed to give the moral law an objective form and reality, and a more immediate sanction and authority, so that it may appeal to the eye and ear and understanding of man as an imperative rule of conduct. Moreover, it was needed to furnish examples of the application of universal principles and laws to all the varying circumstances of human existence, in the light of which we may solve all questions of duty which arise. Christianity was especially needed to exhibit to us a perfect model of all excellence in the person of Christ; and above all, to bring to us the knowledge of a redeemer from sin, to proclaim forgiveness of sin, and to secure for us renewing and sanctifying grace.

The ethics of Christianity are superior to the ethics of the human conscience, because, under its influence, conscience takes a wider range, and has a deeper insight into man's responsibility; just as the religious sentiment, when illuminated and impregnated with the fire and energy of the Christian religion, is superior to the dim and undefined "*feeling* after God" which stirs the heathen mind.

Art. II.—HAGENBACH ON THE LATER HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

1. *Die Kirchengeschichte des achzehnten und neunzehnten Yahrhunderts.* Zwei Theile. Von Dr. K. R. Hagenbach. Leipzic, 1856.
2. *A Text-Book of the History of Doctrines.* By Dr. K. R. Hagenbach, Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. Revised, with large additions from the Edinburgh Translation of C. W. Buch. By Henry B. Smith, D.D., of New York. Two volumes. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1863.

Church History has come in for its full share of recent inquiry. In fact we can call to mind no department of theology, even exegesis not excepted, that has received more attention of late or manifested a greater commensurate improvement. And in this respect we have not been so chary of our German friends as in some others. Nor was there need of much suspicion; for when the clouds of Rationalism began to break from their sky after the beginning of the present century the history of the Church was one of the very first branches of theological study that gave signs of the return of the old faith. And is it not true that the evangelical status of the Church can always be determined by the way in which she writes her own history; or in other words, by the construction she places on those events which constitute her career? Neander's work was the pioneer's ax; and, thanks to the arm that wielded it, it did noble duty in opening the way to renovation. Now we sit at the feet of him and his disciples and hear what they say of the great past of the Church. *It is not a little remarkable that the American Church has yet to produce its first real Church historian. Denominational* and other *fragmentary* historians we have in abundance, and of rare worth; but no American has yet planted his foot on the far loftier eminence of the true history-writing of our common Church. Hence we have been compelled to go to Germany for our Church chronicles or do without them, for England was no better off than ourselves.

But however much we have been at fault in *invention*, we have not been slow in *translation*. We can read Neander,

Hase, and Kurtz in English with almost as much pleasure as if it had been their original language. The German theologians cannot understand how the English-speaking world could have remained so long faithful to those old authorities that they, in their own land, had carefully entombed scores of years ago. When Tholuck, of Halle, was once lecturing to one of his classes he inflicted a scathing bit of wit on the absurdity of Oxford and Cambridge still poring over the learned but antiquated Mosheim. The smiles that played over the faces of his auditors seemed to say, "What a pity the English are so behind the age!" But give Oxford and Cambridge time and they will come up to the standard of you Germans. They are afraid of you on first acquaintance; but after you have stood at their door-step fifty years they will come out and invite you in.

Dr. Hagenbach cannot be termed a Church historian in its widest sense, for he has not written his works in the order of history itself. His course has been to write *on periods:* having finished his examination of one, he has passed either backward or forward over wide intervals to bestow his attention on another. Nor has he confined his labors to the mere historic events of the Church, as an examination of his works will show. His diligence as a writer is abundantly proved by the main events of his life. He was born in 1801, at Basle, Switzerland, where his father, himself an author, was Professor of Botany and Anatomy. Having received his early instruction in his native city, he attended the Universities of Bonn and Berlin. At the latter city he imbibed the prevalent doctrines of Schleiermacher. Not long after the completion of his studies he was appointed Professor of Theology in the University of Basle, and in 1828 entered upon the duties of his office. In the same year he published his *Tabular Survey of the History of Doctrines*, a work which was followed, in 1833, by his *Encyclopedia and Methodology of Theological Sciences;* and this by a series of sermons in four volumes at intervals between 1830 and 1836. The popular work which contributed greatly to the formation of his reputation as a historian was his *Lectures on the Nature and History of the Reformation*, six volumes, 1834–43. His *Church History of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* appeared in a second edition in 1848–49, which

was succeeded by the third edition of the *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, 1852–53. His *Lectures on Ancient Church History to the Sixth Century* was published in two volumes in 1855–56, and in 1860 he issued the first volume of his *Church History of the Middle Ages*. There have been other but minor fruits of his industry, such as two collections of *Poems*, an *Oration on the Memory of De Wette*, and *Religious Instruction in the High Schools*.

The *History of Doctrines* is, we believe, the only work of his which has thus far been honored with an English translation. Mr. Buch's first edition of the translation was published in Edinburgh in 1846, and the second, comprising a part of the additions to the second German edition, was issued in 1850; and a third, without further revision, in 1858. Since 1850, however, Dr. Hagenbach has published two editions in Germany with great improvements and additions. The American editor has availed himself of these, and the fruit of his labors is one of the richest treasures of theological knowledge that has been produced by the American press. In testimony of the value of this work and of the important vacuum that it fills, we cannot do better than to quote Dr. Smith's own language:

> The value of Dr. Hagenbach's work is attested by the constant demand for new editions in Germany, in the midst of much competition. It has, as a text-book, its peculiar merits and advantages, in giving a candid and compressed statement of the main points, fortifying every position by exact and pertinent citations from original sources. The theological position of the author is in the middle ground, between the destructive criticism of the school of the Tübingen and the literal orthodoxy of the extreme Lutherans; while he also sympathizes with the Reformed rather than with the Lutheran type of theology. He enjoys the highest respect and consideration for his learning and candor. And among the works published upon the History of Doctrines, his is still perhaps the one best adapted to general consultation and profitable use. Münscher's Lehrbuch is valuable chiefly as a collection of materials; Ruperti, Augusti, and Leutz have been superseded. Baumgarten—Crusius's Compendium,—and Engelhardt show an abundance of learning, but are deficient in the method essential to a text-book. Meier's Lehrbuch and Beck's simply present the results in a concise form. Gieseler's Dogmengeschichte extends only to the Reformation, and is rather intended as a supplement to his Church History. Baur's work is pervaded throughout by the theory that dogmas are destined to be resolved into philosoph-

ical ideas. Noack's Dogmengeschichte has the same tendency, with less learning and method. Neander's History of Dogmas, admirable in many respects, has the disadvantages of a posthumous publication; it devotes less than a hundred pages to the history since the Reformation.

Dr. Smith might have added that the work which he has so faithfully revised supplies all these defects. Further than this, he has spent an incredible amount of labor in tracing all the phases of English and American theology down to the present time. The controversies, new directions of thought, authors and preachers, we find sketched by him with a conciseness and candor which one can appreciate only by a personal examination of the latter part of the second volume. As we shall concern ourselves chiefly with the *History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, we must content ourselves with simply recommending the *History of Doctrines* to the personal examination of the theological reader. We must add, however, Dr. Smith's timely words on the value of Doctrinal History as a study:

> Among all the branches of theological study, the History of Doctrines has been the most neglected in the general course of instruction in our theological schools. There are not wanting some healthful indications of an increasing sense of its value and importance. Without it, neither the history of the Church nor the history of philosophy, nor the present phases and conflicts of religious belief, can be thoroughly appreciated. It gives us the real internal life of the Church. It renders important aid in testing both error and truth. It may guard against heresy, while it also confirms our faith in those essential articles of the Christian faith which have been the best heritage of the Church. In the fluctuations of human opinion, the History of Doctrines shows the immutability and progress of divine truth.

The eighteenth century marked the dawn of a new order of things both in Church and State. Hitherto there had been fierce fighting. Thousands had fallen on battle-fields. Controversy had reigned in theology, and the struggles between Calvinists and Lutherans were scarcely less deadly than between Protestants and Catholics. But the opening of this century was the signal for the strife to wane. The battle still continued fiercely in some quarters, it is true, but the heart of the people was sick of all war, and a rapidly increasing

indifference in all religious matters began to possess the popular mind. Politics was fast supplanting theology. Ever since the Reformation the masses had heard but little save religious disputes, and now they were resolved to take their long desired revenge. As the spirit of the times had been persecution, controversy, and intolerance, so now it was to be moderation, liberty, tolerance. The tables were completely turned. Voltaire's *Treatise on Tolerance* was a bugle-note for the whole century. He had observed some of the frightful persecutions of the French Protestants, and in this work he embodied his views on religious liberty, which found an echo in many parts of the continent. The word *tolerance* was used on all occasions and to denote liberty to all parties. The politicians seized it and made capital of it. Theologians claimed it as their word, and the use they made of it was a century of cold, heartless Rationalism. Outside of Germany the war spirit did not die away before the middle of the eighteenth century, but in Germany the forces were fast gathering for a long night of skepticism.

There was a strong tendency among the Germans to adhere to French customs and manners. The whole country became pervaded with an inordinate love of everything Gallic. Dr. Hagenbach attaches great importance to this fact, and sees in it a strong indication of the corresponding introduction of French Naturalism and Atheism:

> The French fashions and customs that prevailed at the time of Louis XIV. crept silently but surely, not only into the German courts, but into the houses of the private citizens. In the same ratio was a taste of spiritual things introduced. We can form our best idea by hearing a writer of those very times. There was a time when the French were held in poor estimation by us Germans, but now we cannot live without them. Everything must be French—French language, clothing, cookery, furniture, dances, and music. The French spirit has, by its caresses and flatteries, insinuated itself into our very heart, just as the serpent beguiled our first parents; and it is gradually stealing away our freedom. Nearly all our German courts are established after the French model; and whoever would receive favor at one of them must have been in Paris, which is the University of universal folly, or he can expect no reception whatever. But it is no better in common life. When the children are barely able to creep about they are put away four or five years, to be offered up to the French Moloch; and the parents trouble themselves solely with French masters in language and dancing. No one speaks German in

France save the Germans to one another; but among us Germans the French language has become so common that in many places shoemakers, tailors, children and servants speak it quite fluently. If a young man pays his addresses to a young lady he must be clothed in French hat, vest, and stockings.

This passion for French fashions and theology culminated in the person and character of Frederick the Great. As a boy he gave no signs of future greatness. His father considered him a good poet and musician, but quite unfit for the throne and the battle-field. He termed him "a self-willed, wicked boy, who invariably opposed his father's commands; an effeminate lad, who possessed no manly qualities." Dr. Hagenbach has sketched the intellectual portrait of Frederick with great accuracy, and shows his important relation to the theological tendencies of the century:

In the little city of Rheinsberg the crown prince led a life quite in accordance with his taste. He gathered artists and learned people about him, and was in intercourse with distinguished strangers. He improved his time in study. On the 10th of February, 1738, he wrote: "I am more than ever buried in my books. I am saving of my time, striving to redeem what I lost when very young." The different estimate that he placed upon learned men from that which his father held may be seen in a letter to Rollin: "I consider you and all learned people as stars which must illuminate us in every branch of science. You are the men who must think for us while we act for you." On writing to Algaroth he said: "I look upon men of genius as seraphim in comparison with the common and contemptible multitude who do not think. Men of genius are the blossoms of humanity."

Frederick applied himself closely to the study of Wolf's Philosophy and became fascinated by its specious reasonings. Here commences his correspondence with Voltaire. The latter was flattered by the attentions of the young Prussian, and reciprocated those adulations to which Frederick was not impervious. The style in which they heaped caressing epithets upon each other is amusing. Frederick wrote to Voltaire: "But one thing is wanted here in Rheinsberg to make me perfectly happy—and that is Voltaire. Your picture adorns my library; it hangs over the case in which I keep our Golden Fleece; just over the shelf containing your works and opposite the spot where I am accustomed to sit, so that I may have you

ever before my eyes." In 1839 he wrote again: "There is but one God and one Voltaire in the world, and God needed a Voltaire to complete the perfection of this century. Were I a heathen, I would invoke you in the name of Apollo; were I a Jew, I would reinstate you for the royal prophet and his son; were I a papist, I would implore you as my guardian angel and confessor; but since I am none of these I must content myself with admiring you as a philosopher, loving you as a poet, and honoring you as a friend."

Frederick ascended the Prussian throne determined to carry out this sentiment: "False religious zeal is a tyrant that crushes our country; but Patience is a tender mother that will hedge it about and make it bloom." He determined to carry out the *toleration* which had already become the watchword of his age. He was tolerant to Catholics as well as to Protestants. He granted the former far greater privileges than they had hitherto enjoyed in Berlin, Potsdam, and throughout Prussia. It was under his own auspices that a Catholic Church was built in Berlin after the model of the Maria Rotunda of Rome. He expressed his desire to the Bishop of Breslau that "controversial discourses, both in the churches and cloisters, should in future be avoided and abandoned. As Frederick increased in years he became more under the influence of his skeptical views and correspondingly severe on practical faith. He often spoke of the clergy in the most contemptuous manner. He strove to keep the "priests" as far as possible from having a hand in the education of the young. Theology was to him a foolish science, and he occasionally defined a theologian as "a beast without reason." But Frederick was a man of strange inconsistencies. When in the glory of his skeptical views, and surrounded by the leading infidels of Europe, he forbade the publication of Gebhardt's two deistical treatises that reflected on the credibility of the Gospel miracles, and he banished a young man for six months because of a similar offense. But there was no mistaking the real direction of Frederick's mind; and the influence of his views on German religion was fearful and long-established.

We now come to the consummation of the floating tendencies of the day. Semler appeared upon the scene of theological inquiry and began to deal his heavy blows against the ortho-

doxy of the school and pulpit. He had been well trained by an earnest, praying mother, and never afterward could he lose sight of her pious example. In very early life he was devout and anxious in reference to his spiritual condition. He says: "There was no corner of the house where I did not often kneel and weep alone, praying God to count me worthy of his love and favor." He would often pay his little bills more than once for fear that he had not previously done it. He attended the University at Halle, where he was placed under the influence of Baumgarten, who greatly determined his permanent theological bent. While attending lectures he began to distinguish between religion and theology. He concluded that a theologian needed many branches of knowledge for his success, but his future happiness would not necessarily depend upon the correctness of his views. With him, a man might be a true Christian at heart and yet be in error on some important articles of faith. His distinction between a *private religion and public theology* was the basis of his entire system. He was not creative, but destructive and critical. His works are mostly fragmentary and often chaotic. We think Dr. Hagenbach does Semler ample justice in the sketch of his position in reference to his times. The picture of his private life is so beautiful that we cannot pass by it:

We receive a profound impression of Semler's domestic life and the training of his children when he tells us that his wife sits by his side at work while he is busily engaged in his studies, and that he labors amid the tears and plays of his children. "We had the children continually about us," he says himself, "when they were not engaged with their teacher. We have done the most toward advancing them in reading and other exercises; for we have had them sing a song or a Psalm, or read a few pages in some good book by turns. We sang with them and then asked questions concerning what they had sung. They learned Gellert's songs by rote. There was nothing but peace and contentment in our circle. The servants neither saw or heard anything offensive. The quiet supremacy of my wife controlled all household matters, and there was in every breast mutual love and union. Thus have passed by twenty years of our life amid the most perfect harmony. Both parents and children knew and felt that we were to one another the nearest and dearest of all human society, and we fulfilled our mutual relations without a jar or an exception. But little had been written on the training of children, but we drew our knowledge from the pure fountain of religion; and we needed nothing though we dispensed with much of the *glitter* of life."

For those who would find a fit companion scene to this description of Semler's domestic life we would refer them to the peaceful and triumphant death of his daughter, which he describes in touching language. He concludes his sketch by adding, "*Thus beautifully and Christian-like have people trained in a Christian way been dying these many centuries!*"

From Semler we pass on to Gellert. And what pleasant associations are connected with Gellert, the singer! Many of the German peasantry have for years attached almost a superhuman sanctity to his name and memory. Who can tell how great his influence has been in restraining Germany from all the skeptical extravagancies that has marked the latter history of her neighbor France? Gellert's songs were golden threads that bound Germany, in spite of her Fredericks and his imitators, to the sacred memories and blessings of the Reformation. The attention which Dr. Hagenbach bestows upon his personal character and literary activity shows how important was the place he occupied in the Church history of his day, and how salutary his influence was upon the spirit of theological inquiry.

In order to understand Gellert's position as a spiritual song writer we must consider him with reference to his age. The *spirit* which was the basis of the old songs of Germany had altogether departed. The real and practical had been supplanted by the weak and artificial. Gellert's songs, if they were not of the highest poetic merit, were yet so fully the expression of his pious inner nature that they found a hearty response in the breasts of many kindred natures. "Never did he attempt a spiritual poem," his biographer, Cramer, informs us, "without carefully preparing himself and striving with all his soul to experience previously the truth of his utterances. He then chose his most ecstatic moments for composition, and as soon as his ardor cooled he laid aside his pen until the golden moments came again. . . . Even among Roman Catholic circles Gellert's songs found a welcome reception. A country priest in the mountains of Bohemia had been so impressed by them that he wrote to Gellert and urged him to join the Catholic Church, since this Church could much better reward his good works than the Protestants were able to do. Also in Milan, Vienna, and other great Catholic cities, Gellert found many warm admirers. It is not the fashion of our times to admire the songs of Gellert very enthusiastically, and some are accustomed to shrug their shoulders at the mention of his name. But his opponents come from two classes: first, those of very rigid ideas of

faith, and second, those who take only an æsthetic view of them as poetical productions. The objections that both these classes urge are not without foundation. There can be more purely *Christian* songs than Gellert's; songs that would be the evidences of recent improvement in our language and literature, and might partake of more of the old fire of reformative times, or bear the romantic coloring of mysticism or recent orthodoxy. But all these perfections could not supply the place of the simple glowing language of a Gellert, which was his expression of inner self-experienced truth. Gellert will long remain the poet of our masses. By the agency of pious mothers he will long continue to plant the seeds of virtue in the hearts of tender youth; and where the later tendencies have not obliterated the old German method of domestic training he will continue to save many a young man from the ways of sin. He will still console the sick and broken-hearted. And though but few of his songs have been reserved for use in our Churches, even these few—for instance, *This is the day the Lord hath made*, and the Easter song of *Jesus lives and I live with him*—will continue to elevate our Christian congregations and help them to gain the victory over the world. Gellert has not only influenced one generation by his songs, but has deeply affected succeeding ones. That humble man wished no higher honor than the salutation of any one whom he met, "You have saved my soul—you!" But in the coming world of bliss there will thousands meet him who on earth would have gladly done what the Prussian sergeant did, *walk five miles to press the hand of the man who had saved his soul.*

A GERMAN ESTIMATE OF METHODISM.

The Church historians of Germany have usually passed over the great Wesleyan movement of the last century with a few strokes of the pen. Some of them have seen no good in it whatever, reducing it to a level with Swedenborgianism, or comparing it with the worst extravagancies of the Pietism of their own country. Dr. Hagenbach is the first one who has seemed to survey the whole matter with true historic ken. He appreciates the grandeur of the Reformation inducted by the Wesleys and Whitefield, and devotes an entire chapter to the consideration of the subject. The general silence or misjudgment of Methodism by the theologians of Germany has not been altogether due to a want of knowledge concerning the facts themselves, for German translations have been made of some of those English works best calculated to communicate information on the whole matter. Our author introduces the sources of his knowledge of Methodism, and mentions among other

authorities translations of Southey's *Life of John Wesley*, Watson's *Wesley*, Thomas Jackson's *History of Methodism;* besides works in German, such as Burkhard's *Geschichte der Methodisten in England*, Baum's *Methodismus*, and Hampson's *Leben Wesley's*. We congratulate our missionary, Dr. Jacoby, of Bremen, on the consideration bestowed upon his little *Handbook of Methodism*. He wrote it for practical purposes only; what must be his gratification to find it here serving the purposes of history, and correcting so many of the errors that have been floating about Germany three quarters of a century concerning the Church in which he has labored with such rare devotion.

The picture which Dr. Hagenbach draws of the coldness and deadness of the English Church at the commencement of the ministrations of the Wesleys is at once faithful and vivid. It reminds us forcibly of Dr. Stevens's Survey, and had the former been written more recently we should say that it had been patterned after the latter. The *tone of feeling* which pervades the entire chapter is one of profound respect. The form in which Dr. Hagenbach has chosen to describe Methodism is by drawing a parallel with Moravianism. We think no Methodist can complain of this portraiture of his denomination:

> If we place Methodism and Moravianism together we shall find many features common to both. As Zinzendorf endeavored to organize bands of true believers in Germany and other parts of the continent without dissenting from the Augsburg Confession, so did Wesley strive to instill new life into the Established Church and at the same time awaken Dissenters, while he remained a member of the Established Church, and became no Dissenter himself. Zinzendorf and Wesley were both pious men, though they led two very different courses of life. . . . It was a supreme guidance that conducted these two great movements in a simultaneous career—one to resist the coldness and skepticism of England, the other to correct the religious errors of the continent. Both of these denominations have attached vast importance to the work of missions, and it is chiefly through their instrumentality that the whole Protestant world has imbibed the missionary spirit. And how much Methodism has done for the abolition of the slave-trade has been laudably acknowledged by those who look at religion from the stand-point of humanity. The authority of Wilberforce is enough without any further proof. But what distinguishes Methodism from Moravianism is that the former exerts its missionary energy within the face of Christendom itself, planting the

Gospel at home, evangelizing the masses—which objects we believe the Moravians have never aimed at.

Moravianism, although it kept not aloof from the humble and built no wall of division between the upper and lower classes, approached nearer to aristocracy in some of its forms. Zinzendorf with all his meekness and humility could never lay aside the count; it seemed that a certain rank was natural to him which he was unable to avoid. But with Wesley the case was very different. Nature had made him a man for the masses, and notwithstanding all that native grace and dignity by which he impressed every body, there was in him an utter absence of everything that savored of haughtiness. He once wrote: "I have not the least wish to enter into associations with people of rank—at least for my own sake. They do me no good, and I fear that I cannot benefit them." . . . While Zinzendorf and the Moravians proceeded upon the principles of elevating a few from the upper classes in order to unite these chosen ones, as a spiritual aristocracy, into a *Church within the Church*, Methodism, on the other hand, endeavored to find in the hearts of the lower classes its building material for a Church which was destined, by its zealous and invigorating spirit, to overthrow that old Baal temple of a mechanical and formal Christianity. But there were diverse relations in England and Germany. The people upon whom Wesley operated were not on the same footing as the German masses, since long before this time the Pietists had been influencing them. Hence the Moravians found the soil somewhat prepared for them, while Wesley and the Methodists had only a stony field to cultivate. The poor and needy citizens of Moravia came into natural antagonism to Zinzendorf, while the Methodists sought out the abandoned in the darkest dens of poverty and even stripped the fields of laborers. There is a something in Methodism which borders on the martyr-spirit; certainly a feature which does not belong to Moravianism. In this respect the former has experienced a life much like that of the Reformed Calvinistic Church, (in Germany) while the latter represents conservative and exclusive Lutheranism.

As a further instance of Dr. Hagenbach's warm appreciation of the great importance of the Wesleyan Reformation, he introduces a description of the *personnel* of John Wesley, from Herder's *Adrastea*. As we believe it has never been translated, we render the whole of it:

Seldom have I seen a more beautiful old man. A serene and smooth countenance, an arched nose, the clearest and most piercing eye, a fresh color quite unusual to one of his age, and betraying perfect health—all this gives him an exterior at once interesting and venerable. You could not see him without being struck with his appearance. Many persons who were full of prejudice and opposition to him before seeing him, acquired quite a different

opinion of him after making his personal acquaintance. There was a mingling of cheerfulness and seriousness in his voice, and in all his conduct. He was very sprightly, and one could not but notice the quick variability of his animal spirits, though deep peace reigned within him. If you were to see his profile it would indicate great acuteness of understanding. His dress was a model of neatness and simplicity. A thrice-folded neckcloth, a coat with a narrow standing collar, no knee-buckles, nor silk or satin on his whole body, but crowned with snow-white hair. These gave him the appearance of an apostle. . Cleanliness and order shone out from all his person. . . . In social life Wesley was lively and communicative. He had been much among men; he was full of anecdotes and experiences which he related *willingly*, and what is of not less importance, *well*. He could be very cheerful and pleasant. His elasticity of spirits communicated itself to others, and suffered so little beneath the weakness of age or the approach of death that no one could think that he was as happy in his twentieth as he was in his eightieth year. His temperance was remarkable; in his early life he carried it much too far. He commenced fasts and other forms of self-denial at Oxford, and indulged in but little sleep. But toward the close of his life he relaxed somewhat from this rigid regimen.

Wesley was one of the most industrious men. Even yet he has not ceased to travel. If he had not possessed the art of dividing his time very systematically, he could not have done what he has. But every item of business has its own hour. He went to bed between nine and ten o'clock, and rose at four. No society, no conversation, however pleasant, nothing but a case of sheer necessity, could induce him to break his rules. In the same methodical way he wrote and traveled and visited the sick. It has been calculated that he delivered forty thousand four hundred and sixty discourses, to say nothing of the multitude of addresses he made to his societies and classes. In his early life he traveled on horseback. The reins resting on the horse's neck, he held his book before his eyes and studied. It is thought that in fifty years he traveled two hundred and eighty thousand English miles. No one of a less powerful body than his (?) could endure this ceaseless activity. He composed songs and added melodies. He made singing doubly pleasant, for he had the male and female voices interchange parts; he appointed singing exercises, so that when there was no organ in the chapel its place might be amply supplied by accomplished vocalists; he sometimes made sacred music the subject of discourses. The singing of many thousands of Methodists in the open fields, in forests or graveyards, was sometimes accompanied with wonderful effect.

Wesley was remarkably benevolent. His kindness to the poor knew no bounds. He not only gave away a portion of his income, but he gave away all he had. He even commenced to do this in early life. . . . But with all his beneficence his was not an impressible nature. The expressions of his love seemed to flow,

not so much from the fountains of his nature, as from a profound sense of duty. His heart was not susceptible of real attachment; he was not formed for friendship. If he bestowed special attention upon individuals, it was that he might make them more useful, and because of his personal attachment to them. His sole aim was the advancement of Methodism. If any one of his coworkers did not conform to his plans he was thrown overboard, like Jonah from the ship. He was very forgiving—one of the most remarkable qualities of the whole man. . . . He not only bore persecution without wrath, but almost without any perceptible feeling. If his authority was invaded it provoked his violent indignation. He says of himself, "Nothing was easier to me than to forgive offenses." Just as soon as his opponent yielded Wesley was disarmed, and met him with great kindness and consideration.

We might demur to some points of the foregoing account; but there is such a candor of purpose and general correctness, that we will not delay to do it. The very few blemishes it possesses will be at once perceived and remedied by the judgment of the Methodist reader. When we remember that at the time it was written all Europe was full of absurd rumors concerning Wesley, and more than all, that the writer was a German, our only surprise is that the portrait is as elevated and truthful as it is. We are glad that Dr. Hagenbach has given it a place in his valuable history.

The nineteenth century is heralded by the cannon of revolution. The French Revolution at the close of the eighteenth century was and will be to modern political history what the German Reformation of the sixteenth has been to the religious history of Europe. But the spirit which marked the dawn of the present century was one of universal revolution—in philosophy, literature, education, religion, Church, and theology. At first sight one could only see the ruins of old modes of action and thought, but amid these very ruins the eye of wisdom could perceive the elements of new growth and strength. There were two men who were calculated to determine, to a great extent, the future currents of intellectual action, Herder and Kant. Herder was a German, and his views were destined to affect German theology in no slight degree. Kant, though a German too, had a cosmopolitan mind, and his tenets were sure to wield a powerful influence upon the world's thinking and believing. Herder had been a pupil of Kant; but when the latter seemed to be uprooting the old systems, the former attacked him with

all the ardor of his nature. But Herder was less the logician than the poet, and he was unsuccessful. We suspect it would have taken many stronger men than he was to battle down the reasonings of Kant. That it could have been done, and that it will still be done, there can be no doubt. The European mind, however, was glad to find such a ditch as the *Critique of the Pure Reason* into which it might fall. Kant did not affiliate with the destructive Rationalism of his day, and some of the doctrines that the rationalists would reject he strove to bring back to an honorable position. We may take his views of original sin for example. He could not sympathize with the humanitarianism of Rousseau. He was unable to see how man was good and innocent by nature. According to him, man is a selfish being, thoughtful only of self-happiness. This he called *radical sin*. Man being thus impure by nature, he must be developed into something worthy. But here is where Kant failed: *in teaching that man can be developed by human instrumentality into a noble and pure being, while such a masterwork can in reality only be accomplished by Divine agency.* With him Christ, Christianity, Bible, Church, and Church doctrine were not empty sounds, as with some of the ruthless Rationalists. He did not make light of them, but treated them with serious thought. Hence his blows, when they did fall, were all the heavier. In holding up the claims of Reason to the world, Kant succeeded in reviving a certain form of rationalism which was at that time on the wane. He numbered a multitude of disciples, who followed in his footsteps where they could understand him, and when they could not they perverted his meaning, and still called themselves Kantists. His was as cold and dead a system of philosophy as has ever professed consanguinity with Christianity. Had it not been for him, notwithstanding all his good intentions, the reign of Rationalism would have long since been ended.

Dr. Hagenbach draws a good sketch of the absurdities of the older Rationalism:

> While some would acknowledge the Divine authority of the Bible, others did not hesitate to dispute it. But the Rationalists would only see in it what answered the purposes of morality or natural religion. Especially must the miracles be stretched upon the rack of torture. To cast them off as poems and legends but very few ventured to do, so great was the respect for the word of

God. Some said, however, that there were no miracles. A different reading would give a more *reasonable* interpretation. They were with them only oriental pictures and illustrations which no one could be expected to take in their literal *prosaic* sense. When God spoke from heaven it only thundered and lightened. When angels appeared it was an optical illusion. The latest discoveries in natural science, such as electricity, magnetism, and other departments of inquiry, must meet the difficulty when grammar fails. Soon a wide field was opened to the deriders of the Bible when this method of explanation was fairly installed. The more reasonable and moderate critics saw the difficulty, and, not wishing to bring greater discredit on the Bible, excluded miracles from their inquiries as not important for the purposes of religion. What the Rationalists said of miracles in the exterior world they affirmed with equal confidence of the interior life. When the Bible speaks of the extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, it only means the *action of the Reason*. To be born of the Spirit is no more than to become a reasonable, moral, respectable, and useful person. And when Paul says, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me," he only employs an oriental, poetical expression for, "I can do all things by the aid of my reason, by the exercise of my moral nature, which is assisted by the example of Jesus." Whoever demands more than this is a mystic and an enthusiast.

These very claims of Rationalism, made many years ago in Germany, and so destructive of evangelical faith, are the same that are now presented, though in a modified form, to the enlightened understanding of the Christian people of our day. The *Essays and Reviews* are only a rehash of the effete Rationalism of Germany. Hengstenberg is certainly good authority on this subject, and he says in a late number of his *Church Gazette:*

We Germans have reason to be ashamed of this movement. In the first place it is significant in this respect, that nine thousand clergymen of the Church of England have signed a protest against this book, and that all the bishops have been unanimous in its condemnation. We are accustomed to such daring attempts, and the zeal for the house of the Lord is so little alive among us, that on similar occasions only isolated voices are raised among us, and our ecclesiastical authorities observe a deep silence. Yet there is another reason for our being ashamed. *The authors of the essays have been trained in a German school.* It is only the echo of the German infidelity which we hear from the midst of the English Church. This German infidelity is also the evil demon of North America. The people, from which once, at the time of the Reformation, the blessings of the fear and the love of God were widely poured out through the lands, has now become a spring of infidel-

ity for the world, and those who drink from its waters are poisoned and must die. Let the long blight which has fallen on Germany, and which in its incipiency was but the parallel to such works as the *Essays and Reviews*, and Colenso's *Pentateuch and Joshua*, remind us of the danger of yielding an iota to the claims of recent Rationalists. The brightness of the ecclesiastical history of the eighteenth, and the former half of the nineteenth centuries, has been marred by it. May no one in the coming years be able to repeat, "that this German infidelity is also the evil demon of North America."

Dr. Hagenbach does not underestimate the influence of the German stage upon theology and religion. Such men as Goethe and Schiller, and all the romancists, could not attract such a large share of popular attention without affecting the spiritual life of the people. We are sorry that their literature was not more salutary. They found their generation formal and rationalistic; and they left it the same, save perhaps with a little more hope. In the relation of Goethe and Schiller to Christianity we must concede the loftier place to the former, as far as Christian knowledge and confession are concerned. The intercourse of Goethe with Fraülein von Klettenberg proves how lofty his views were concerning the Moravian type of religion. What sound and beautiful expressions on the superlative worth of the Bible meet us in his autobiography, and in his conversations with Eckermann. Can any one speak a stronger word against the revilers of the Scriptures than he when he said, "The higher the centuries advance in cultivation and refinement, the more devotedly will the Bible be employed by wise men, if not by fools, in part as the foundation, and in part as the instrument of all instruction?" But Goethe looked upon religion more as an instrument to reach a loftier refinement than an end to be aimed at. He worshiped art. There is more to admire in Schiller than in Goethe, and the Germans will always love him more. But Schiller was a worshiper of paganism. He could have lived in the days of Horace and Mæcenas without doing violence to his nature. Had the translation been possible, we believe he would have preferred it. If a warm piety and profound respect for the Bible had pervaded Germany at the time that Goethe, Schiller, Herder, and others surrounded the little court of Augustus at Weimar, who knows what might have been the influence of

those men upon all Christendom? A poet may be great with a pagan muse to inspire him, but with a Christian muse he is more than great, he is *useful*. Think of Milton writing such a poem as Schiller's *Gods of Greece!* And this is what he might have done were it not for the Christian spirit that animated his age. It is the religious impulses that can convert poetry into not only an agent of civilization, but of evangelization. And we believe that, in every period, poetry is the thermometer that indicates the religious temperature of the nation. Depend upon it, when a land grows skeptical poetry becomes as veritable a tell-tale as Midas's wife. But when piety becomes all-pervading, poetry will be first to reach the mountain-top and thrill the winding valleys and lofty hills with her harp-notes of joy.

STRAUSS AND HIS LIFE OF CHRIST.

Hundeshagen, in his *History of German Protestantism*, attributes the strong reaction of Rationalism in the present century to the Treaty of Vienna, which crushed the life out of the German heart. The fruit and quintessence of this reaction was Strauss's *Life of Christ*. It was the most unmitigated piece of Rationalism that the world ever saw, because it dealt with the no less sacred character than the Founder of Christianity. Strauss was the exponent of the Left Hegelian School. What the Church and believing world had hitherto claimed to be the true history of Christ, he pronounced to be no history at all—nothing but a mere myth. The word *myth* was not a new one; neither was it a product of the Hegelian philosophy. It had previously been employed by ultra Rationalists; and even Origen, in his allegorical effusions, made free use of it. Strauss would draw a line, broad and clear, between the historical and symbolical. De Wette had done this long before when he decided many of the historical events of the old Testament to be purely *mythical*. Even Schleiermacher did not hesitate to say that the Gospel narratives of the early life of Christ and of his ascension were mere *poetical* descriptions of truth. But what he and others like him only said in a modified and measured way, Strauss blurted out without qualification or moderation. He not only held that the exterior life of Christ was perverted by mythical descriptions, but that the

very *essence* of his life was penetrated by a pious but poetical imagination. Strauss reversed the common belief that Christ organized the Church, and contended that the Church had constituted him, that it had *spelled* him out of the Old Testament prophecies, and from the hopes and expectations of the age. A rich cluster of wonderful narratives collected about his life, so that something really historical and actual was quite difficult to discover. But it never came to pass that what Strauss thus tried to establish *historically*, was built up into a *doctrinal system*. This was a step for which the darkest type of Rationalism was utterly incapable. God had said, "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

Rationalism was passing though its death-struggles in the bold attempts of Strauss and his sympathizers. Henceforth the stream of Church history flows clearer, and through an increasingly beautiful territory. After all the theological and religious convulsions through which Germany has passed since the death of the reformers it is consoling to know that evangelical faith is once more in the ascendency. No historian has dared to deny this. We cannot forbear to introduce Dr. Hagenbach's glance at cotemporary spiritual life in Germany. We think it will remove some existing prejudices and errors:

> The study of the Bible has not only acquired an impartiality in the last few years, but also vitality and interest. How differently is an epistle of Paul or John explained in our high schools now to what it was a quarter of a century ago! Now the study of the Scriptures is pursued with Christian zeal and moderation; and it is no longer thought all-important to quibble about words, but to penetrate into the spirit that lies beneath them. . . . When Neander said that the task of the Church historian was "to represent the history of the Church as a living proof of the divine strength of Christianity, as a school of Christian experience, and as a voice of edification, doctrine, and warning for all, sounding down through all ages," people called his language the effusion of a Pietist. But Neander's view has already won the upper hand. . . . Special historical subjects are pursued with great enthusiasm. The lives of distinguished and worthy men of exalted piety are vividly portrayed. Instead of the dry recital of facts, we find history and biography sketched in living colors. An ardent interest is taken in the monuments of Christian art and customs, and we are beginning to see something more than bald stone in the Churches that have come down to us from past times. Attention is directed toward hymnology, and the old system of music which was in

vogue eighty or ninety years ago is no longer tolerable. If any one will compare one of our present hymn books with one of that period, he will see that the wind is now blowing from quite a different quarter. And what an improvement in the preaching of our day! The stiff, logical, measured style of sermonizing, which was rife in Reinhard's day, has had to give way to something more earnest and less formal. Harms says, "We must preach in tongues," and the pulpit is fast losing its frigidity. . . . Those large churches which stood empty at the time of the French Revolution and the empire are now filled with auditors, some of whom are from the most cultivated classes. People are beginning to take more interest in all ecclesiastical matters than formerly. The form of worship and Church government, about which no one used to care a fig, are now subjects of profound attention. When Rationalism was strong, people only visited the church to compliment the minister, and he used to *recommend them to visit the Church;* but now they come from a love of worship, and a sense of their great spiritual necessities.

Formerly we saw but little practical outgrowth of religion; but recently we find a great zeal, activity, and self-sacrifice to extend the kingdom of God. *Yes, this has never been so great since the Reformation as it is to-day.* In the past it was left to Pietism, Methodism, and Moravianism to preach the Gospel to the heathen, to extend scriptural and Christian knowledge among the masses at home, and to organize beneficiary institutions. . . . There is a Christian spirit of usefulness at work, which is humane as well as divine; and it is breaking up that old one-sidedness and developing itself into true practical life. No one can deny that Pietism is still a vital power itself and makes itself felt, and will not give place to any system like liberalism or communism. The positive power of Protestantism is all the time gaining the mastery over its negative forces, and this is pervading all society. Let us hope that this practical spirit will increase, and continue to show its beauty in an humble way.

These are comforting words, and we trust that the promising dawn will ripen into a bright day. Our author takes an equally cheerful outlook upon the future:

We wish, as far as the Church in our own land is concerned, that the band of faithful ones will be purified of its injurious elements. A mere return to the olden time we do not desire. Modern development, such as has taken place in philosophy, literature, and education, can no more be thrown back than the flowers of spring into their youthful buds, or the sunbeams into the darkness of the past night; or the stream back again to its mountain source. Who dreams of such reactions and restorations? Who would like to forget Lessing, Herder, Kant, Schiller, Goethe, Pestalozzi, Fichte, and Schleiermacher, and all the heroes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and pass away over to the controversial

times preceding them. Let him do it who will. Who but a dreamer could even desire the return of the golden age of Luther? No, the nineteenth century can never become the seventeenth or sixteenth. . . . But it is certain that as the eighteenth was a transition point into the nineteenth, so do we stand in the middle of the stream, and the waves are flowing on beyond us. . . . *It is our part to place implicit trust in the power of truth—to be thoroughly imbued with the love of truth.* It was thus that Luther rose, through sorrow and doubt, above the quibbles of sophistry. And it is upon this lofty eminence that our Protestantism must stand. Until she succeeds in doing it her history is not complete. She will have her battles yet to fight. But truth cannot be won by dreamy thought. Prayer, labor, and faith in God will gain the prize. And every one must exercise these qualities himself if he would make truth *a possession of his nature.* What shall be the future of our Protestantism? I know not fully the answer. But we shall gain ascendency not by outward forms. It is the spirit that must do it; not the spirit of the times, which is an intoxicating term to so many thousands, but the spirit which, in spite of all changes, will lead into all truth—the Comforting Spirit. We cannot tell when the time of true Protestant freedom will arrive. The signs are deceptive. They sometimes indicate one phase and then another. But this we do know: *that time will come.* It may be far off still, and it may be nearer than we think.

This is earnest language, and we hope it will not prove the dream of a visionary. When the *freedom-time* does come, Dr. Hagenbach will have done something toward its arrival. We had marked many other passages in his history of which to give a translation, or at least a summary. The work is replete with fascinating pictures, such as his *studies* on Herder, Schiller, Reinhard's earnest preaching, Swedenborg, and Zinzendorf. Of all the recent publications of the German theological press, we know of none more eloquent in style or choice in material. The promise of its translation has already been made to the American public, and the publication of it may be expected in a few months from the present date. We trust, however, that the time is not far distant when we shall not have to depend on other countries for our standard of ecclesiastical history. Removed as we are from the traditional prejudices and ever-recurring skeptical phases of Europe, we are, more than any other people, calculated to trace the eventful life of that heritage of Christ which has braved the flood and frost of so many winters of opposition.

Art. III.—OUR LORD'S PRAYER IN THE GARDEN.

What was the "cup" which our Lord desired might pass from him? To a reverent discussion of this question we propose to devote the present article. In the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and one of the epistles of St. Paul, is contained all that relates directly to the subject. For the convenience of the reader we make full quotations from their writings:

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.	PAUL.
And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt. . . . He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done. . . . And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words.—xxvi, 37–44.	And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; and saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch. And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt. . . . And again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words.—xiv, 33–39.	And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done. And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.—xxii, 41-44.	Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared.—Heb. v, 7.

With these texts before us we return to the question with which we began. Three principal answers have been given to it.

I. The first is that of "Grotius and others, who, taking the cup to be a figurative expression for death, understand our Lord as praying that he might, if it were possible, be excused from his undertaking and suffering the penalty of death."

This theory has the support of many and distinguished names, among whom may be mentioned Dr. Gill, Whitby,

Bishop Pearce, Dr. A. Clarke, and Dr. Kitto. The last named writer says: "The 'cup' must have been the scenes of suffering that lay before him. It is hard to see what else it could have been; and the supplication to be excused from drinking it shows that the temptation lay in this, that the suggestion was not as formerly, that he should exalt himself to earthly honor, but simply that he should waive the duty he had undertaken. The 'agony,' which word means wrestling, striving, struggle, lay not so much, we apprehend, in the dread of what lay before him, as in the strong-handed conflict against the suggestion; and the utmost to which he could for a moment be brought was to pray that if there could possibly be found any other way for man's deliverance he might be released from his obligation, but if not, God's will be done. And the Father did manifest his will by the angel, who came not to relieve him from the cup, but to give him strength to drink it even to the dregs."

Holding, as we do, the incorrectness of this theory, it is not without regret that we find so discriminating a writer as Dr. Kitto among its advocates. Let us see how slender is the foundation upon which it rests.

1. The definitive τοῦτο, *this*, used by our Lord to limit the cup, contains a plain intimation that the object from which he sought deliverance was not the cup of crucifixion. For if death on the cross, and not some more proximate object, were intended, would he not have said ἐκεῖνο, *that* cup, instead of *this?* Such at least would have been the more accurate form of expression according to the modern and common use of these pronouns; for while the object of suffering and dread then present might well be designated "this cup," the crucifixion, which did not take place till the next day, could not, without verbal inaccuracy, have been indicated by the same term.

To this it may indeed be objected that the scenes in the garden and on the cross are to be regarded as one continuous event, and that the phrase "this cup" covers that event in all its stages. To which we reply, that the prayer of Christ was either answered or it was not. If it was answered, the cup could not have been the crucifixion, for that actually occurred some hours after. If it was not answered, as Dr. Kitto and

others teach, we must expect to see the "agony" continued without intermission from the moment when it seized Jesus in the garden till he expired on the cross. What were the facts? No sooner had he uttered his plaintive prayer for the third time than he arose victorious from the scene of conflict, and with manifestly altered tone and feeling said to his disciples, "Rise, let us be going." He did not wholly cease to suffer, but he was delivered from that overwhelming agony which constituted so bitter a portion of the deprecated cup. Nor was there a recurrence of extreme suffering until, hanging upon the cross, another and quite different cup was presented to his dying lips.

During the interval between his garden-prayer and the crucifixion the bearing of Jesus was more that of a calm victor than an agonizing sufferer. As Mr. Wesley remarks, "With what composure does he go forth to meet the traitor! With what calmness receive that malignant kiss! With what dignity does he deliver himself into the hands of his enemies! Yet plainly showing his superiority over them, and even then, as it were, leading captivity captive." In all his successive arraignments before Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, Herod, and Pilate again, he exhibits no sign of perturbation or anguish, but a quiet waiting for the death-struggle on Calvary.

2. The Greek preposition *ἀπό*, *from*, used in connection with the verb *παρέρχομαι*, *to pass away*, clearly points to some other event than the death of the cross as making up the cup of our Lord's prayer. In every instance in which these words stand together they imply contact, connection, participation, and point to a separation or removal. Hence it will not do to render the passage, "Let this cup (crucifixion) pass *by* me;" although numerous commentators have founded their expositions of it upon the idea which such a rendering would convey. They refer for illustration to "a very ancient method of poisoning criminals," and explain the clause "pass from me" as containing "an allusion to several criminals standing in a row who are all to drink of the same cup, but the judge extending favor to a certain one, the cup *passes by* him to the next." Surely this is wide of the meaning intended, for it was not a passing *by* of the cup for which Jesus prayed, but a passing *from* him of that cup.

This is determined by the preposition which follows the verb, the two never being used in connection when the idea of passing by is intended. In the latter case the verb is always found either alone, or in connection with some other preposition than ἀπό. Let the reader consult Mark vi, 48; Luke xi, 42; xix, 37; Acts xvi, 8, etc. Although in these and all kindred passages the same verb is employed that occurs in the prayer, yet, not being followed by the preposition in question, the sense conveyed is that of avoidance, omission, a passing by; whereas in every petition of the prayer the verb is followed by *from*, a fact which necessarily implies a separation or removal. But can a thing be separated or removed from a person with whom it never had contact or connection? Already had Jesus taken a fearful draught of the cup, and ere he reached the dregs he implored its removal. Accordingly in Mark we read, "*Take away* this cup from me;" and in Luke, "*Remove* this cup from me." Now if, as the lexicographers tell us, to remove or take away means "to cause to *leave* a person or thing," it is plain that the thing from which Christ sought deliverance was a realized, and not merely an anticipated cup.

3. The peculiar form of statement in St. Mark's narrative obliges us to refer the cup to some other event than the crucifixion: "And he . . . prayed that, if it were possible, the *hour* might pass from him." Verse 35. Is not "the hour" of this verse simply equivalent to "this cup" in the next verse and in the narratives of Matthew and Luke? Praying, therefore, that the hour might pass from him, was the same as praying that the cup might be removed. What hour was it? That it was no part of the hour or period embracing the betrayal, the mock trial, and the crucifixion, is evident, first, because the preposition and the verb show it to have been a present hour; and, secondly, because our Lord, having emerged from his agony, said to his disciples, "Sleep on now and take your rest, behold, *the hour is at hand*." The one hour is ended; another begins. The hour of the prayer has passed from him, and with it the half-drunk cup of agony; another, and wholly distinct, hour ensues, of which the dying conflict and undying triumph of Calvary are to form the sad but joyous close.

4. Finally, the predictions of Christ respecting his death *upon the cross* preclude the idea that his prayer in the garden

could have reference to that event. In no less than half a score of recorded instances did he distinctly foretell his crucifixion. Each prediction is positive, having no condition expressed or implied. Nor does he anywhere speak of his death as an unwilled or dreaded fate, but as a voluntary act, to which he looked forward with solemn longing. "No man taketh my life from me. I lay it down of myself." "With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer," that very passover as he knew, being the strongest possible type of his own approaching death. "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished," words which nervously express the painful, eager expectation with which he waited the signal from his Father to enter the field of toil and blood and victory. With these predictions agrees the language of Paul: "Who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame." There is not in all the New Testament an intimation that he desired to "be excused from his undertaking." His mission to earth was to die upon the cross. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." This was according to God's decree, and in agreement with his own will and purpose. Can we conceive of him as changing that purpose in the garden, or as seeking to escape the high appointment of his Father? If, with Dr. Kitto, we assume that the agony consisted in his "strong-handed conflict with the suggestion, that he should waive the duty he had undertaken," the difficulty is rather aggravated than relieved.

This hypothesis carried out would lead to the monstrous conclusion that the hitherto immaculate Jesus was guilty of yielding to temptation. So far, in fact, does he yield as to pray, even "with strong crying and tears," that the enemy's suggestion may obtain acceptance with the Father, as it had found favor with the Son.

While we venture no opinion as to the peculiar weapons with which the infernal powers assaulted him, we regard it as certain that the slightest temptation touching the vital object of his mission would have been as promptly resisted as was the temptation in the wilderness. The remonstrance of Peter, "Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee"—

spoken in answer to Christ when he had foretold his crucifixion—was not more quickly met with the stern rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense unto me," than would have been a suggestion of like character from the devil in Gethsemane. It is not too much to say, that Jesus was *above temptation on that point.* Yet the hypothesis of Kitto obliges us not only to admit its presence with him, but its influence over him, begetting desire, and leading to earnest prayer for its accomplishment. Could Jesus thus succumb to the adversary and still remain innocent?

To entertain temptation in the thoughts is a fault: to concur therein and seek the object it proposes is a crime. But Jesus knew no sin. His prayer in Gethsemane, therefore, must refer to some other event than death upon the cross. That death he never sought to shun, and, so far as we know, was never tempted to escape.

II. The second answer to the general question before us is that advocated by Mr. Watson, who says: "The cup here spoken of was his bitter anguish and unspeakable sufferings" in the garden. This was the view of Dr. Doddridge, and had been urged at length by Dr. Thomas Jackson, whom Doddridge quotes with favor. Sir Matthew Hale, Hooker, Coke, Burkitt, Benson, Dr. John Brown of Edinburgh, and others of like distinction, may also be reckoned among its advocates. The same arguments by which the theory of Grotius is disproved, may be relied upon to establish this. Both hypotheses cannot be correct, yet we can conceive of no theory that does not involve the one or the other. Mr. Watson, therefore, in establishing his own position, needed to do scarcely more than demolish that against which he wrote. How well he accomplished this may be learned from his Exposition.

III. The third theory on the subject is that put forth by Dr. Whedon in his note on Matthew xxvi, 39. We give it in the following extract: "What was *this cup?* Not the crucifixion, but the present supernatural agonies of the garden. For as his sorrows were greater than his strength, they opened up before him a just and true fear that a complete catastrophe, even to unknown depths of failure, could result. Those terrible results lay as dregs at the bottom of the cup. And, as Paul says, (Heb. v, 7,) *He was saved (heard) in that he feared.*

From that fearful and inevitable *break-down*, which he justly feared and could escape only by obtaining supplicated aid, he was saved. But was this failure truly possible? Not only possible, but surely certain, but for the power of this same faithful prayer, and for the true spirit in which the Redeemer offered it. O how narrow was the pass of danger through which our Jesus trod to his and our redemption! *Pass from me*—Saint Paul truly says that this prayer was *heard*. Causes were bearing down upon this lonely victim, as sure to crush as the railroad car would the shrinking infant lying on its track. Before the dregs of the cup were reached the draught attained its limit!"

This exposition of the passage differs materially from both the other theories, being totally opposed to that of Grotius, and going quite beyond Watson's, though embracing it.

We confess to an admiration of its bold originality, and the terse clearness with which it is proposed, but find ourselves hesitating to adopt it. It carries us so long a stride beyond the ground we have been accustomed to occupy that we fear to venture to its full length. There seems to us one fatal objection to it, suggested by the closing portion of the prayer: "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt."

If the idea of a "break-down" was involved in the cup, could our Lord have consistently used this language? Was it possible for him to conceive of a "failure" as being the "will" of his Father? Or is it possible for us to conceive of a solemn devout acquiescence on the part of Christ in that which would contradict all prophecy, blast his own cherished hopes, and doom to hell forever a whole world, just on the threshold of redemption? Yet the thing prayed against under the designation of "this cup" was certainly contemplated by our Lord as the possible will of his Father, which will he accepted as supreme. But could God deny himself? He had willed the redeeming plan; he had willed the incarnation of his Son; he had willed the sacrifice of Calvary; and now, when that sacrifice was about to be offered, could he will a failure? To ask the question is to answer it; to state the proposition is to refute it.

But notwithstanding this objection is fatal to Dr. Whedon's view, taken as a whole, we welcome his exegesis as tending to

incite inquiry on an interesting but much neglected subject, and also as helping to furnish a key to what we deem the true explanation. That explanation, we think, lies midway between the two theories last named. Mr. Watson's falls short of the full truth; Dr. Whedon's goes beyond it. That death in the garden was the result deprecated by Christ is, we doubt not, susceptible of satisfactory proof; but that he feared a break-down as connected with that death is, for the reasons stated, wholly out of the question. We therefore separate Dr. Whedon's theory, adopting the one part as correct, but rejecting the other as untenable.

Our position is this, that the cup which Jesus prayed might pass from him was neither more nor less than *death in the garden*. The pangs of that death he had begun to realize when his prayer was offered; the cup he was even then drinking, and shrank from swallowing its thrice bitter dregs. In corroboration we refer to Matthew xxvi, 38; Mark xiv, 34; and Hebrews v, 7. Was it a mere figure of speech that Christ employed when he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even *unto death?*" Was it not rather a literal truth to which he gave utterance? Did he not conceive himself to be in the very presence of death? And was not that conception true? Surely his language is misleading if death, actual, stern death, had no connection with his agony and his prayer.

And now let us see how clear a luster this exposition gives to that otherwise obscure passage in Hebrews above alluded to, and how in turn it becomes a proof-text of the greatest value in settling this whole question. It is agreed by all the expositors whom we have consulted (excepting only Macknight) that direct reference is here made to the scene in Gethsemane; but as there is much difference of opinion touching the last clause of the verse, we pause a moment to ascertain its meaning. The margin reads, "for his piety." Mr. Wesley's translation and paraphrase stand thus: "And being heard in that which he particularly feared." But we notice a strange inconsistency between his note on Matthew xxvi, 39, and that on the passage before us. In the former he says the cup "did pass from him quickly. When he cried to God with strong cries and tears, he was heard in that which he feared." But in the latter he affirms just the opposite: "And he was heard, not so that

the cup should pass away, but so that he drank it without any fear." What does this indicate but the want, even among commentators, of clear and fixed ideas on the subject? Still in both places Mr. Wesley's rendering of Paul's statement shows that he understood it in a sense directly opposed to the marginal reading.

Bloomfield says: "It is a disputed question whether the expression εὐλαβείας should be rendered *fear* or *piety*. Either sense is permitted by the *usus loquendi*, and especially the former, which is a signification of the word most frequent in the later Greek writers and the Septuagint, and is here preferable on the score of greater strength and suitableness. . . . The full sense then will be, 'was heard in respect to that which he feared;' that is, was heard so as to be delivered from this fear."

The exposition of Stuart is similar. "The classic sense of εὐλάβεια is fear, dread, and this is the sense in which it is commonly employed in the Septuagint. But as the Hebrew יִרְאָה, yirah, and יָרֵא, yārā, mean reverence, and to revere, as well as fear and to fear, or dread, so the Greek εὐλάβεια, εὐλαβείας, etc., are sometimes employed to designate the idea of reverence, and consequently of piety, devotion, religion. But the usual classic sense of the word is to be preferred in our verse, namely, fear or object of dread, like the Hebrew מוֹרָא, mōrā." He accordingly translates the passage thus: "From that which he dreaded Christ was delivered; or, his entreaties were listened to in respect to that which he dreaded."

That εἰσακουσθείς, *heard*, may here have the force of answered, that is, delivered, is evident from Luke i, 13, and Acts x, 31, where the same word occurs: "Fear not, Zacharias, for thy prayer is *heard*." "Cornelius, thy prayer is *heard*." This use of the Greek verb, Robinson tells us, is taken from the Hebrew, and means to hear *favorably*, to *grant*. Hence Gesenius, in defining the Hebrew עָנָה, refers for illustrations of its meaning to such passages as the following: "Save me from the lion's mouth; for thou hast *heard* (delivered, saved) me from the horns of the unicorns." Psalm xxii, 21. "He shall call upon me, and I will *answer* him: (literally, *hear*; that is, defend, deliver;) I will be with him in trouble; I will deliver him, and honor him." Psalm xci, 15. "Then shalt thou call,

and the Lord shall *answer;*" (literally, *hear;* that is, bless, enlarge, prosper, as the context plainly shows.) Isaiah lviii, 9.

With these points of verbal criticism thus disposed of, this passage may be deemed scarcely less than decisive of the case in hand. Briefly analyzed it stands thus: 1. The prayer of Christ was offered "to him that was able to save him from *death.*" What death? Not the death of the cross, for God was not able (with reverence be it said) to save him from that death. He could not do it without contradicting himself; without overturning his own plans; without dethroning truth and justice; hence it was a moral impossibility. What death, then, can be intended? We can conceive of but one, death in the garden, the fearful foreshadowings of which were realized in the agony and bloody sweat. 2. The death from which our Lord sought deliverance was an object of *dread.* For it can hardly be doubted that the "fear" mentioned in the last clause has immediate reference to the "death" of a preceding clause. That death, consequently, was the object of his dread. But is there any proof that death upon the cross was so repugnant to his pure nature as to impel the offering up of "prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears," to be excused from undergoing it? There is a large class of Scriptures with which this supposition will not harmonize.

So Dr. Whedon, in his sermon on Substitutional Atonement, says: "In the prayer poured forth with his agonizing sweat, he prays, not so much exemption from the coming cross, as deliverance from the *present* 'cup,' whose dregs he now is drinking. Not one thought of fear." Yet St. Paul affirms there was a death which he feared. The scene of that dreaded death was Olivet. This application of the apostle's language, and this only, makes the history of the garden seem natural and appropriate. For while the scene on Calvary had stood out in bloody relief to the Saviour's vision during all the years of his ministry, so rendering it familiar to his mind, the fearful conflict in Gethsemane was not only sudden, but unexpected. It had not been predicted by the prophets, and, so far as we know, the Father had not seen fit to reveal it to him, just as he had not chosen to make known to him the "day and hour" of his final advent. Keeping this thought before us, we are not surprised to read of his being "*sore amazed.*"

"Amazed," says the writer last quoted, "as if depths of horror, mysteries of evil, rolled themselves up before his view, so frightful, so unutterably strange, that even *his* prescient mind had never yet conceived them." This sudden amazement belonged to the garden, not to the cross. The latter he had long been anticipating and preparing for. For the understood purpose of enduring it he came into the world. Of it he had talked often and familiarly with his disciples. But now, as if by surprise, the powers of hell are let loose against him; they threaten to overwhelm him; his immaculate body and soul are almost ready to yield to their crushing pressure; death, all the more terrible for being unanticipated, and because no physical agents are employed to produce it, is fast closing about him; he prays: "Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me." His prayer is heard; the object of his dread is averted; he is saved from instant death. 3. This leads to a third remark: he was *delivered* from that which he feared. But was he delivered from death on the cross? His mocking enemies said of him while hanging there, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him." But God did not deliver him; it was not his purpose so to do; nor do we learn that it was Christ's desire. He was now undergoing the bloody baptism of atoning death, and it must be accomplished. But there *was* a death from which he was saved. Where shall we find it but in Gethsemane?

Thus far we agree with Dr. Whedon. But we see no reason for the assumption that death in the garden would have necessitated a "failure" in the work of redemption. What would have been its effect is a question we shall not attempt to answer, except incidentally. The answer to it depends upon the solution of another and more important question, namely, *How may the supposed possible death of Christ in the garden be reconciled with the resignation clause of his prayer,* "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt?" We submit the following three answers:

1. May we suppose that the expression "not my will, but thine be done," was the *involuntary* utterance of his oppressed and agonized human nature? Upon the mount of transfiguration one of his disciples had said: "Let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, one for Moses, and one

for Elias, not knowing what he said, for they were sore afraid." Was this the condition of Jesus in Gethsemane? He was doubtless under the influence of fear. The Godhead seemed, for the time being, to withdraw its support from the assaulted humanity, and to leave it to struggle alone with invisible and mighty powers. Did the fearfulness of that struggle unman him? Was the intellectual in his nature overcome by the purely emotional? A woman in childbirth cries out, "I shall die!" and resigns herself to her fate by exclaiming, "The will of God be done!" Was Jesus now enduring the throes of a world's second birth, and did the appalling terrors of threatened death extort the half-conscious utterance, "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt?" Of course, if these suppositions be accepted as correct, we are not bound to explain how Christ could conceive his threatened death to be the will of his Father, inasmuch as the allusion to that will was the simple *emotional* utterance of human nature left wholly to itself. Let those adopt this solution who can; we cannot.

2. But taking the qualifying clause of the prayer as the expression of a clear, intelligent conception by our Lord that his death in Gethsemane was the possible will of his Father, may we harmonize the two by supposing that the death of the garden might, in the view of Christ, be *substituted redemptively for the death of the cross?* This hypothesis will oblige us to adopt another, namely, that there must have been in the mind of Christ some conception of a sudden change in the divine plan of redemption, as yet unrevealed to him by the Father. For he had steadily looked forward to the cross as the scene of his sacrificial death, and had constantly affirmed to his disciples that by murderous human hands, and not by unseen devils, he was to be slain as the world's atoning victim. May God, as in other cases, have "repented"—not, indeed, by changing his purpose, only his administration? But if the will of the Father was to substitute the nearer for the remoter death, could Christ have remained in ignorance of it? Why not? There were limitations to his human knowledge on other subjects; so on this the Godhead might withhold communication with the humanity.

We confess, however, that this mode of relieving the difficulty is by no means satisfactory. And if the substitution of

Gethsemane for Calvary was not possible in the conception of Christ, is it not at least a doubtful assumption that the sufferings of the garden were equal in atoning merit with those of the cross? Yet the former have sometimes been exalted even above the latter. Dr. Adam Clarke, speaking of the agony in the garden, says: "In my opinion, the principal part of the redemption price was paid in this unprecedented and indescribable agony." Dr. Whedon, in the sermon already referred to, says, on page 5: "We repudiate the notion that the woes of the garden were the pangs of a mere human fear of approaching death, and affirm that they were a distinct and independent part of atonement. We see the sufferings of redemption in Gethsemane as on Calvary. In the garden man was lost by Adam the first; in the garden was man redeemed by Adam the second." Again, on page 15, he says: "Dream not because Gethsemane's work was invisible, and thereby less impressible upon our senses, that it was any the less an integral part of the atonement. More, rather."

We hope to be excused for saying, with these quotations before us, that it remains to be proved that the sufferings of Gethsemane possessed any atoning merit, except in the broad indirect sense that the whole life of Jesus was atoning. Was his conflict with Satan in "the wilderness," on "the pinnacle of the temple," and in the "exceeding high mountain," atoning? Rather was it not a *preparation* for his atoning work, *not* a *constituent part of it?* And was not the conflict in Gethsemane similar, and for a similar purpose? The first onset was made near the beginning of his ministry, but the tempter being repulsed, "departed from him *for a season*." When that ministry was about to close we may well conceive that the designated "season" had been fulfilled, and that another and mightier assault was made by the same Satanic powers. Nor is it unworthy of remark that in each struggle and subsequent triumph, Jesus enjoyed the ministry of angels. As the two cases are clearly analogous in several important particulars, we see no sufficient reason for connecting the one with his atoning work more than the other. They rather both belong to his *life*, which is nowhere presented to us as a sacrifice for our redemption, but as an example for our imitation. *Atonement is specifically and uniformly associated with the death of the*

cross. Christ *crucified* was the theme of the apostles' preaching. They always ascribed redemption to his *blood.* The object of Paul's glorying was the *cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ. In no single instance is his agony in the garden referred to, or hinted at, as a cause of redemption; but his death on the cross is everywhere spoken of as the cause, and the only cause. That death is hence represented as *necessary* — a point which is argued with great force and conclusiveness by Mr. Watson in his Institutes.

All this is confirmed by the significant fact that under the Jewish sacrificial system atonement was always connected with the slaying of the victim. Whatever the character or extent of the preparations, the point of atonement was reached only when the victim was *offered* by being *slain.* "So," says Paul, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." *When* this offering was made, he tells us in another passage, "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit *offered himself* without spot to God," etc. The scene of this offering could not have been Gethsemane, for there he strove against the immolation that threatened him; but on Calvary, "as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." Let the reader also compare the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah with Zechariah xiii, 7. In the former we read: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. . . . The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. . . . For the transgression of my people was he stricken. . . . Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief," etc. Here we have a divinely-drawn picture of that mysterious wounding, bruising, and smiting of the Son by the Father, the hidden nature of which a "creature" may not "dare to guess," but in which are affectingly summed up the great atoning sufferings of Jesus. When was this picture realized? Let Zechariah explain Isaiah. "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: *smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.*" The smiting and the scattering were to be coincident. But during all the agony of the garden the disciples continued with Jesus; nor was it till after he had delivered himself to his murderers

and the mock trial began which introduced the crucifixion, that "all the disciples forsook him and fled." One more passage may suffice: "I have trodden the winepress *alone;* and of the people there was *none with me.*" Isaiah lxiii, 3. By common consent it is Christ who here speaks, and speaks of his atoning work. But if that work was wrought in the garden, though only in part, this passage is contradicted, for "there appeared an angel unto him from heaven strengthening him." Strengthening him for what? Certainly not to endure the pangs of expiation. For this he neither had, nor needed, angelic or human aid.

"*Alone* the dreadful race he ran,
Alone the winepress trod."

We have indulged in this digression because of its important bearing upon the main question at issue. For if the sufferings of the garden were not atoning in the proper sense, it follows that the cup of which he there drank was wholly distinct from that which he afterward received, even to its mortal dregs, upon the cross. A beautiful harmony is thus established between the prayer of Jesus and the statement of Paul. It also gives a peculiar beauty and force to the language of Christ to Peter on the occasion of his betrayal and arrest: "Put up thy sword into the sheath; the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" One cup had just passed from him; another is soon to be presented. The one he shrank from with agonizing fear; the other he is calmly waiting to receive. The one was forced upon him by infuriated *devils;* the other is peculiarly the *gift of his Father.* The one was a cup of trial; the other is a cup of atonement. Between this cup and himself Jesus would suffer nothing to interpose. As if he had said: "Put up thy sword; make no resistance to my clamorous foes; let my murderers have their way. It is only by thus humbling myself that I can be exalted. It is only by enduring the cross that I can attain the joy that is set before me. This is the cup my Father hath appointed me to drink."

3. May we suppose that the threatened death of Christ in Gethsemane was conceived by him as the possible will of his Father, not as a substitute for death on the cross, but as *preliminary to it?* This supposition places Jesus on a thoroughly human footing in the garden, with his intellectual, emotional,

and moral nature in a condition of healthful and vigorous activity. *First*, we see him exhibiting all those signs of fear and trembling which men are wont to show in times of danger and alarm. Yet, *secondly*, we find him in full possession of his mental powers, with perception and judgment performing their appropriate functions; and, like other men, excluded in his degree from a full participation in the divine counsels. This is placed beyond doubt by the terms of his prayer, "*If* it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as *thou wilt*"—expressions which clearly indicate a limitation of his knowledge as to what was possible, and what was the will of his Father. *Thirdly*, in moral qualities he is presented to us as "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," one "who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." These characteristics belong to him in the garden as elsewhere. Accompanying them we read of prayer and obedience as practiced by him, and these imply faith; not, however, justifying faith, such as the sinner needs to exercise in order to be saved, but still faith, faith in God. This, indeed, the sinner must have, but he must superadd to it faith in Jesus. Hence his parting instruction to his disciples, "Ye believe in God, believe also in me," thereby teaching us that fallen creatures require both a general and a particular faith. The former was appropriate to Christ; the latter as an unfallen being he needed not. Now, while the *knowledge* of Christ had its limitations, we may safely assume that his *faith* was without such limitations; for perfect knowledge belongs to Deity alone, while perfect faith belongs only to perfect angelic and human beings. Such a being was Christ considered purely in his human nature. See him left in that nature amid the overshadowing darkness of Gethsemane! His mental vision is unable to penetrate the dense gloom that surrounds him; but his faith falters not. The revelation had been distinct and positive that he must become "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," in accordance with which he had prophetically declared, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me;" and "this he said signifying what death he should die." That the death thus predicted was crucifixion is plain from John xviii, 31, 32. Could the purpose of the Father touching this death be subverted? Or could the

predictions by which the Son had given utterance to it fail? Impossible. Yet immediate appalling death even now threatens the struggling Saviour! His innocent soul, shrinking back from this unexpected cup, deprecatingly implores its removal! But what if the will of the Father should be to permit this dreaded catastrophe? Must a total "failure" ensue? Must a fearful final "break-down" result? O, *here comes in the faith of Abraham*, of whom Jesus was at once a son and an antitype. Could not God as easily raise up Jesus from this death to fulfill the divine purpose and pledge of crucifixion, as Abraham had once believed him able to raise up Isaac from the dead to be a progenitor of Christ? It was not difficult for the faith of Jesus to grasp this idea. The crucifixion was a fixed unalterable fact in his mind; and though the marshaled hosts of hell might even overcome his helpless humanity ere it should reach the cross, yet God was faithful, and would certainly quicken that humanity to accomplish the appointed sacrifice of Calvary.

Was it not this consideration which prompted the resignation clause of Christ's prayer? He certainly knew that the Father's will involved his final death by crucifixion, but conceived that it might also involve surprising antecedents, even death in the garden and a resurrection from its blood-stained soil, preparatory to death on Calvary, and a resurrection from the new tomb of Joseph.

To this solution of the question the objection may be urged, that the Scriptures contain no intimation of any such faith as we have ascribed to Christ. To which we answer, that there is no intimation in the Old Testament of the nature, objects, and extent of Abraham's faith. "The Gospels and the epistles," says Kitto, "clearly tell us wherein lay that faith of Abraham which was counted to him for righteousness;" and then adds: "It must be admitted that on the surface of the narrative the expectation and hopes of Abraham are temporal, and the promises also. It is refreshing thus, by the aid of the later Scriptures, to penetrate to their inner meaning and find that they were not such." So when St. Paul in the eleventh of Hebrews says, "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac . . . accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the dead," he reveals a phase of the patriarch's faith which it

is not possible for us to gather from the twenty-second of Genesis, or any other portion of the Old Testament. It was reserved to the supplemental revelations of the New Testament to disclose to us the full extent of his trust in God. And as the Holy Ghost was thus not pleased to state all the facts connected with his trial in the Hebrew Scriptures, so he may have judged it fit to withhold from the writers of the Christian Scriptures similar facts connected with the agony of Jesus. But were it the will of God that an additional written revelation should be made to men, we might hear another Paul speaking thus of him who took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham: "By faith Jesus, when his soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death, resigned himself to the will of his Father, accounting that he was able to *raise him up even from the dead to make atonement on the cross.*"

Other objections may occur to the reader, but we need not now pause to anticipate them. Enough has been written, if not to settle the question, at least, we hope, to awaken inquiry on the subject, and to call forth other and abler discussions of it.

Art. IV.—ARITHMETIC.

A Higher Arithmetic, Embracing the Science of Numbers and the Art of their Application. By A. Schuyler, A. M., Professor of Mathematics in Baldwin University. New York: Sheldon & Co.

Arithmetic is the science of numbers and the art of their application. The reciprocal relation of science and art is, to all who cultivate either, a subject profitable for reflection. Science requires a basis of facts, and this basis is furnished by the discoveries made to meet the necessities of art. Thus the art of speaking preceded grammar, since the facts of speech form the basis of the science of language; the art of thinking preceded logic; the art of navigating, the science of navigation; and the art of war, military science. In its primitive form, art is necessarily crude and imperfect; but the facts empirically discovered to subserve the purposes of art are classi-

fied in the light of the principles of reason. To the facts thus classified are applied the processes of *induction* and *deduction*, by which are developed other facts and principles which are also classified, thus constituting a system of truth called *science*. Science now, in turn, reacts on art, rendering its processes more rational and perfect. Again, art furnishes science with its peculiar language, consisting of its technical terms, its nomenclature, and its system of notation, thus contributing greatly to its flexibility and efficiency. Art without the aid of science is crude and imperfect, and science without the aid of art is chimerical and futile. As art in its incipient state precedes science, so the art of calculation preceded the science of numbers. It may not be uninteresting or unprofitable briefly to trace the progress of Arithmetic from its crude beginning to its present advanced state of perfection.

The art of calculation must, at least in its rudimental form, have been coeval with the first stages of civilization. The origin of Arithmetic is not, therefore, to be referred to any one nation in particular, to the exclusion of other nations; for since it is indispensable in commercial transactions, and even in the ordinary business of life, it must have been understood to some extent, however imperfectly, by the first generations of civilized man.

The progress of the development of any science depends, to a great extent, on the facilities at the command of those who cultivate it; and among these facilities, by no means the least, is the perfection of the language or system of notation by which the elementary facts of the science together with their relations can be concisely expressed; and in no science is this more strikingly exhibited than in Arithmetic. We have historical evidence that Arithmetic was carefully cultivated by the Greeks. Both Thales and Pythagoras, who traveled to the East in search of light, cultivated Arithmetic with great success; but the labors of Pythagoras, valuable as they were, degenerated into the chimerical scheme of attempting to account for the facts of the universe by referring them to the properties of numbers. According to the Platonists, "Arithmetic should be studied, not with gross and vulgar views, but in such a manner as might enable us to attain to the contemplation of numbers; not for the purpose of dealing with mer-

chants and tavern-keepers, but for the improvement of the mind, considering it as the path which leads to the knowledge of truth and reality."

The Greeks represented numbers by the letters of their alphabet. In this respect they seem to have imitated the Hebrews; for, as they had no letter corresponding to the sixth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, they represented the number six, not by the sixth letter of their alphabet, but by another character. The following was the Greek notation:

They represented

The units by $\overset{1,}{\alpha'}\ \overset{2,}{\beta'}\ \overset{3,}{\gamma'}\ \overset{4,}{\delta'}\ \overset{5,}{\epsilon'}\ \overset{6,}{\varsigma'}\ \overset{7,}{\zeta'}\ \overset{8,}{\eta'}\ \overset{9.}{\theta'}$

The tens by $\overset{10,}{\iota'}\ \overset{20,}{\kappa'}\ \overset{30,}{\lambda'}\ \overset{40,}{\mu'}\ \overset{50,}{\nu'}\ \overset{60,}{\xi'}\ \overset{70,}{o'}\ \overset{80,}{\pi'}\ \overset{90.}{\,\text{ϟ}'}$

The hundreds by $\overset{100,}{\rho'}\ \overset{200,}{\sigma'}\ \overset{300,}{\tau'}\ \overset{400,}{\upsilon'}\ \overset{500,}{\phi'}\ \overset{600,}{\chi'}\ \overset{700,}{\psi'}\ \overset{800,}{\omega'}\ \overset{900.}{\text{ϡ}'}$

The thousands by $\overset{1000,}{,\alpha.}\ \overset{2000,}{,\beta.}\ \overset{3000,}{,\gamma.}\ \overset{4000,}{,\delta.}\ \overset{5000,}{,\epsilon.}\ \overset{6000,}{,\varsigma.}\ \overset{7000,}{,\zeta.}\ \overset{8000,}{,\eta.}\ \overset{9000.}{,\theta.}$

Ten thousands by $\overset{10000,}{,\iota.}\ \overset{20000,}{,\kappa.}$ etc.

The letter *M* was also used to denote a myriad, or ten thousand; and *M* placed under other expressions for numbers multiplied by ten thousand; thus $\overset{\phi\kappa\delta'}{\text{M}}$ denotes 5240000.

By a proper combination of the letters, and by the extension of the scheme of notation exhibited above, the Greeks could express any number whatever.

Though this system of notation is vastly inferior to the one now in vogue, yet the Greeks displayed great ingenuity in its use, and made considerable progress in the science of numbers. In this respect they far excelled the Romans. In fact, the system of notation adopted by the Greeks was much superior, for the purpose of calculation, to that adopted by the Romans, as it is more analogous to the present system. To ascertain how ill-adapted the Roman notation is to the purposes of calculation, let an attempt be made to multiply together, for example, the numbers MDCCLXXIV and DCCCXCVIII. No wonder the Romans thought the operation of calculating a drudgery fit only for slaves!

To obviate the difficulties in calculating resulting from their imperfect notation, the Romans resorted to calculating machines, one of which, the most common, was the *abacus*, or a board on which were placed *calculi*, or pebbles, by the various

arrangements of which the calculations were performed. The modern abacus, or numeral frame, used in primary schools to aid the mind of the young learner in comprehending the relations of numbers, may be considered the Roman abacus modified and brought to perfection by modern ingenuity.

For the system of notation now in vogue called the *Arabic*, which possesses so many and such decided advantages over all other systems, the Europeans are indebted to the Arabians, who in turn are indebted to the Hindoos. The characteristics of this system are *the simplicity of its characters, the decimal scale*, and *the device of place.*

In respect to the characters 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, let it suffice to say they possess, in a high degree, the characteristics of simplicity and beauty.

The decimal scale was undoubtedly suggested by the primitive mode of reckoning by the ten fingers and thumbs. The following conventional principles form the basis of the decimal system:

One, or a unit of the first order, is the primary basis of all numbers. Ten units of the first order equal one unit of the second order; ten units of the second order equal one unit of the third order; in general, ten units of any order equal one unit of the next higher order. Numbers are thus considered as formed into collections or groups, according to the scale of ten. Eight, twelve, or any other number might have been adopted as the scale; hence the decimal scale is to be considered, not as essential to a system of Arithmetic, but as conventional. Some have thought that a *duodecimal scale* and *twelve* characters would have afforded additional facilities for calculation, since twelve has a greater number of aliquot parts than ten. Thus, of twelve, the aliquot parts are its halves, thirds, fourths, and sixths; while of ten, the aliquot parts are its halves and its fifths. If, however, we consider how large a place in calculating, and in the various mathematical tables is occupied by decimal fractions; and if also we consider that similar fractions formed according to the duodecimal scale would not possess superior advantages, the superiority of the duodecimal scale, if still claimed, is reduced to an inconsiderable value. The decimal scale answers every practical purpose, and mathematicians generally are satisfied with it. But the crowning excellence of the Arabic system is *the device of place.*

We have already discussed the different orders of units, and have found that they are related according to the scale of ten; that is, *ten units of any order equal one unit of the next higher order.*

How, then, is this relation of the orders of units to be expressed? When figures are written side by side, thus, 345, the place in which the figure on the right stands is called the first place; the place next, on the left, the second place, etc. Units of the first order are written in the first place; units of the second order in the second place, etc. Thus, 65 expresses six units of the second order and five of the first, or six tens and five units. Simple as is this device, it has done more for the science of Arithmetic than perhaps any other one thing. The invention of decimal fractions is simply an extension of this device to a descending scale of fractional units formed according to the scale of ten. They can therefore be written in the same manner as integral numbers by placing the decimal point (.) at the left of the place of tenths, which separates the integral units from the fractional.

Since the introduction of the Arabic system of notation into Europe, about the beginning of the eighth century, the advancement of Arithmetic toward perfection has been very rapid. The Arabians carried it into Spain, whence it was introduced into France about the year 970 by Sylvester II. It soon passed into England, and was rapidly diffused throughout Europe. Though this system is called *Arabic*, yet the Arabians do not claim to be the inventors, but acknowledge that they originally received it from the Hindoos of India. In the library of Leyden there is preserved an Arabic treatise on Arithmetic entitled, "The Art of Calculating according to the Method of the Indians."

We shall briefly mention some of the more prominent of the older authors who have written on the subject. Euclid wrote on Arithmetic in the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth books of his Elements. Nicomachus wrote a treatise relating chiefly to the classification of numbers. Boethius wrote on Arithmetic about the beginning of the sixth century. Jordanus wrote a treatise in the year 1200, which, after the lapse of three centuries, was printed. Lucas de Burgo, an Italian monk, published a work entitled *Summa de Arithmetica*,

which was the first work on Arithmetic ever printed. Bishop Tonstall published, in 1522, a work on the *Art of Computation.* About the middle of the sixteenth century Robert Record published his Arithmetic, which subsequently became famous, and passed through several editions. In 1556 Tartatia, an eminent Italian mathematician, published an elaborate treatise on Arithmetic. Since that time the works on Arithmetic that have appeared in Europe and in America can be counted by scores. Many eminent mathematicians have recently written upon Arithmetic, and great improvements in the method of developing the subject have been made. A few of these improvements we propose to consider.

Notation is commonly defined, *The art of expressing numbers;* but this is taking altogether too narrow a view of the subject. A much more comprehensive definition is, *Notation is a graphic method of expressing numbers, their denominations, relations, and the operations to be performed upon them.*

Numbers are of two kinds, abstract and denominate. To distinguish the various kinds of denominate numbers, symbols of denomination become necessary. Notation, therefore, embraces four distinct classes of symbols, namely: *Symbols of quantity, symbols of denomination, symbols of relation, and symbols of operation.*

In the work whose title stands at the head of this article, this general view of notation is taken, and the whole subject is then presented, at one view, in a comprehensive summary. Thus far we have referred to notation only in its permanent form; but there is another branch, which may be styled *provisional notation*, which, when skillfully employed, renders most efficient aid in the development of a science. A much more systematic use is made of this form of notation in the work under consideration than in any other heretofore published. To select one instance from many, let us take the subject of *Interest.* The quantities considered are the *principal*, the *rate per cent.*, the *time*, the *interest*, and the *amount.* By denoting these quantities respectively by their *initial letters*, thus securing a *natural notation* which is readily remembered, we have the following: p, r, t, i, a. Now, these quantities sustain certain definite relations to each other, of which the two fundamental are the following: $i=prt$, and $a=p+i$, in

which r is expressed decimally as hundredths and t in years. It will be seen at a glance that this method gives power over the subject, enabling us to deduce, without difficulty, all the consequences. Thus: $p=\frac{i}{rt}$, $r=\frac{i}{pt}$, $t=\frac{i}{pr}$, $p=a-i$, $i=a-p$; and by combining the two formulæ, other cases are readily deduced. Thus is enlarged the field for the exercise of inventive power, which, though a gift of nature, depends to a great degree for its success upon the resources at the command of the inventor. In thus presenting the general relations of the quantities considered, conformity is made to the true method of science, whose province is pre-eminently *the relations of things.*

Another characteristic feature of the work consists in the summaries annexed to the various subjects, thus enabling the mind of the student to obtain clear and comprehensive views. These summaries will also be useful for reviews, for examinations, and for reference. To illustrate, we give as a specimen the

SUMMARY OF SIMPLE INTEREST.

	Given.	Required.	Formulæ.
1	p, r, t.	i, a.	$i=prt$, $a=p(1+rt.)$
2	p, r, i.	t, a.	$t=\frac{i}{pr}$, $a=p+i$.
3	p, r, a.	i, t.	$i=a-p$. $t=\frac{a-p}{pr}$.
4	p, t, i.	r, a.	$r=\frac{i}{pt}$, $a=p+i$.
5	p, t, a.	r, i.	$i=a-p$, $r=\frac{a-p}{pt}$.
6	p, i, a.	r, t.	r and t *indeterminate.*
7	r, t, i.	p, a.	$p=\frac{i}{rt}$, $a=\frac{i(1+rt)}{rt}$.
8	r, t, a.	p, i.	$p=\frac{a}{1+rt}$, $i=\frac{art}{1+rt}$.
9	r, i, a.	p, t.	$p=a-i$, $t=\frac{i}{r(a-i)}$.
10	t, i, a.	p, r.	$p=a-i$, $r=\frac{i}{t(a-i)}$.

In the work referred to these cases are given separately, the formulæ deduced, and examples given for solution. Then follows the above summary, and miscellaneous examples. Similar remarks will apply to other subjects. By this method an exhaustive treatment of the subject is attained, and a comprehensive and thorough knowledge communicated. It may, perhaps, be proper to say a few words in vindication of this

method, particularly in reference to the propriety of introducing letters into Arithmetic. Let it be borne in mind that no objection is made to the practice of resorting to geometrical principles in illustrating the process of extracting the square and cube roots. It is then conceded that in Arithmetic we may seek for resources in other branches, when the subject is thus made more clear, and there is no more impropriety in resorting to Algebra than to Geometry. Let it also be observed that the letters, as here used, are not employed in a strict algebraic sense, but as *abbreviations;* thus p for principal, etc. But the practical question is, Does this method possess superior advantages, and can it be understood? That it presents a more comprehensive view we have already seen. That it can be readily understood we shall now show.

Suppose that we have the formula $i=prt$, and it is required to find p in terms of i, r, and t, we have only to remember the principle: *If the product of three factors be divided by the product of two of those factors, the quotient will be the remaining factor.* But i is the product of the three factors p, r, and t, therefore $p=\frac{i}{rt}$. It will also be observed that this method demands a knowledge of principles, but the study of principles affords the most vigorous exercise for the rational powers, and consequently is the most available means for their development. The object of the study of Arithmetic is twofold—to acquire useful knowledge, and to secure proper mental discipline; and such is the correlation between the human mind and truth, that what will best promote the one of these objects will secure the realization of the other.

Many other topics of interest might profitably claim our attention, but we must content ourselves with a mere enumeration, hoping that the reader will for himself examine the work. We would call especial attention to the following subjects: *Notation and Numeration, Contractions in Multiplication and Division, Properties of Numbers, Fractions, Ratio and Proportion, Average, Square and Cube Roots,* etc.

The study of this work will afford an excellent preparation for the higher mathematics. It can also be studied with profit by many who think they have long since finished the subject, and who regard it as a condescension on their part to study so elementary a subject as Arithmetic; and even those

who have passed through a mathematical course might examine the work with great pleasure and profit to themselves.

The proper study of Arithmetic is highly important, not only because it is the means of acquiring useful information and a rigid mental discipline, but because in this study must be laid the foundation of sound mathematical knowledge.

The last is a revised edition, containing an *Appendix*, in which is discussed the more abstruse portions of Arithmetic. Thus we find articles on the Division of Fractions, Proportion, Interest, Partial Payments, Equation of Payments, Annuities, Contractions in Extracting Roots, Position, etc. It has been a source of perplexity to many why the *United States Rule* and the *Vermont Rule* for *Partial Payments* should give different results, since each seems to be founded upon a correct conception. The origin of the fallacy is the assumption that the interest is proportional to the time; or by throwing t out of the formula, that the rate varies as the time. Thus it is assumed that three per cent. for six months is equivalent to six per cent. per annum. But this is not the case; for collecting the interest at the expiration of six months, interest could be obtained on the amount for the remaining six months of the year; and this latter amount would exceed the amount of the given principal at six per cent. per annum. It then becomes an important question to decide, What rate for a given time is equivalent to a given rate per annum? This equivalent rate, found and applied to the subject of Partial Payments, will give the same result whether the United States Rule or the Vermont Rule be applied, and thus harmonizes them.

Annuities, certain and contingent, are discussed in so thorough and systematic a manner that the difficulties are transformed into beauties. Many other points of interest might be reviewed, but we forbear.

We commend this work to our institutions of learning and to educators generally, believing it admirably adapted to induce vigorous thinking, and thus to advance the cause of sound learning.

Art. V.—SCHILLER.

[FROM THE REVUE CHRETIENNE.]

In the history of literature we meet with both poets and prose writers who exhaust their originality in the first work they give the public. After this one grand effort, they seem to retain only vitality sufficient to compose variations on their favorite theme, or to exaggerate their distinctive qualities. But the true genius rarely manifests himself early. He has within a germ of strength that requires time for development, and its fruits need the sunshine of experience to ripen them. He is the oak made more vigorous by storm, the trunk and branches of which grow robust with years. Such was Schiller. He was born in Würtemberg, in 1759. At his first appearance he attracted interest though he was justly charged with many defects, the faults of his epoch, youth, and inexperience. Wieland frankly told him, that though not satisfied with his productions he found in them the promise of an eminent writer. He commended his firm outlines, vast compositions, and vivid coloring, but desired more correctness, purity, and taste; more delicacy and refinement. "His judgment coincides with yours," said Schiller, in writing to his friend Körner.

Schiller's spirit was eminently progressive. Far removed from that mediocrity which is happy in its small intellectual treasure, the poet was never satisfied with himself. His zeal for perfecting has even marred the perfectness of some of his works. Lacking the promptness of Goethe's poetic genius and the clearness of his intuition, Schiller yet astonished Goethe himself by his giant strides. The conscientiousness of the man and the artist, a predominating love of perfection, and the obstinate labor of meditation, took the place of facility with its dangerous allurements, and accelerated his progress by rendering it sure.

Genius or not, the man is influenced by his country and his time. If gifted with a high order of intelligence, he considers the tendency of the age and passes sentence upon it; where he associates himself with it it is of his own free will, not as a slave. Schiller was a pupil of the eighteenth century in

philosophy, politics, and religion. Rousseau was his early master. He called him "the great Rousseau," and in a youthful poem which he dedicated to his memory he extols him as a martyr for truth and humanity.

Strong minds, like common ones, receive their first education from the external world; but the true genius is quite other than the product of his age, he is *himself*. As the soul, in the materialistic system of philosophy of Condillac, is only a blank sheet upon which the sensations imprint ideas till it at length gains the appearance of life and intelligence, so, in letters, most mediocre authors are enriched by external influence and a thousand various impressions; their surroundings are their support. The man of a higher order of mind, on the contrary, although connected with the world, has in himself a vital force, which directs his destiny and is the source of great thoughts. At times this lofty spirituality is allied to genius, then it shines, and we are astonished and carried away by it. Schiller is a noble exponent of this spiritualism, and has himself eloquently argued against the opposite system. *Nemo unquam vir magnus fuit sine aliquo afflatu divino.*

Schiller's mind was too vast for him to comprehend its powers immediately. His early aspirations were vague. A future of literary activity, of poetry, of devotion to the dignity and honor of humanity, seemed to him at times lit up with sunshine, at times obscured by clouds. Yet great thoughts constantly welled up from the deep fountains of his intellect.

A mingling of enthusiasm and speculation, of inspiration and analysis, was early apparent in our poet. When his genius soared he observed it closely; reflection accompanied it even in its raptures. Schiller studied himself incessantly, both as man and poet, in order to know himself and to attain perfection. Rectitude of conscience and the rule of reason were the same for him in the domain of talent as in that of ethics. This uprightness, and the necessity he felt of investigating everything, so as to walk with a sure step, led him to philosophy.

Schiller's philosophy is a key to the correct understanding of his poetical works. Though not a poet born of philosophy, it aided him to move freely in the highest regions of thought. The period of his most earnest occupation with philosophic

studies, preceded and accompanied his professorship at the University of Jena, to which he was called in 1789. From 1792 to 1796 he published his various works on the principles of the Beautiful. He was the first to make an extended application of the philosophy of Kant to esthetics. Outside of Königsburg, this philosophy was nowhere professed with more zeal than at Jena when our poet arrived there.

Having learned, before he knew the profound German thinker, to philosophize with J. J. Rousseau, philosophizing being to think for one's self, he acquired still greater independence of mind in bringing the two writers together. The influence of Rousseau was apparent in his social philosophy, that of Kant in his analysis of the intellectual faculties and of the laws of the will or moral science. He agreed with the great philosopher in the first of these sciences, and appeared to in the second. He, at first, like Kant, made virtue and morality consist in submission to duty without any view to interest, pleasure, or recompense. Kant in his *imperatif catégorique*, (moral obligation prescribed by reason and conscience,) subjects human life to the absolutism of reason without taking the sensibilities into account. Schiller soon carried the whole of man, his heart included, into the region of the abstract. Kant based ethics upon a law, and separated from that basis every inclination as a foreign, almost an impure motive. Schiller, agreeing in this with Rousseau, added to the law a sympathetic motive, the love of good. Thus the moral type that he extols in his poems, and which he has embodied in the "Marquis of Posa," had its origin.

Schiller's independent and progressive meditations were to extend the ideas and formulas of Kant still further. No one in imitation of the master had more distinctly defined the domains of the good and the beautiful, nor shown more conclusively that moral science could not repose on an esthetic base, the notion of duty not being a matter of taste or sentiment. To each of the two domains he assigned its fundamental law. He did not eventually deny these principles, but he transformed them: he did this in the most original part of his philosophy, his Esthetics. His ideas expanded as he advanced in this, as in every other field of thought. He is one of those writers whose works should be studied in their chronological

order. His papers on Esthetics, published at first, for the most part, in the two literary journals which he created in succession, *Thalia* and *Die Horen*, are even more important than numerous. In spite of their diversity of aspect, a sustained attention will discover, underlying them all, less of variation of opinion than of amplified unity.

In Schiller, the speculations of the philosopher and the creations of the man of genius proceed from his personality; he was pre-eminently a man: as nature and human life in their collective activity filled him with enthusiasm, we might say that he was *passionately* a man. Hence the analysis in which he had followed Kant throughout, with all the exactness of his distinctions and definitions, resulted with the poet-philosopher in a magnificent synthesis. He embraced the life of nature and the senses, the life of the intellect and the heart, and the moral life, in one. He recognized in man the dualism of good and evil, the frequent opposition of desire and duty, and looked forward to find in the high regions of intellect the ideal of humanity. This tendency is the clew to his principal works.

Schiller had separated the good and the beautiful, not as opposed, but as resting on different principles. They may, then, unite at that point where philosophy and poetry mingle, in which philosophy is lyrical and enthusiasm philosophical; this is seen in his poem of the *Artists*, and several others, as *Ideals*, *The Ideal and Life*. Moral life being the supreme destiny of man, the moral ideal, represented under beautiful forms that awaken love, is the noblest aim of art. Schiller did not think it detracted from the principle of the beautiful that moral good should aid the inspirations of art. The theory of this conciliation is especially set forth in the treatise on *Grace and Dignity*. This was trying to unite Kant and Goethe. He incurred the blame of both: that of the absolute moralist for having accorded too much to nature; that of the mere artist for not having conceded enough. In the midst of this controversy, Schiller, by the grasp of his ideas, by his passionate love of the beautiful, by clearness of exposition and pleasing forms, fertilized the soil of esthetics more than any other writer of his country.

Schiller's poetry, thus enriched by the spoils of philosophy, appeared more powerful than ever: it was triumphant, radiant.

Poetry, like art in general, is connected by its purpose and means with the senses and sensibilities, the earth and the passions. To attain its aim, the worship of beauty, it disengages these from their gross elements and brings them forward under pure and beautiful forms. Beauty of form is a triumph of thought over matter. The mere contemplation of works of art habituates the mind to finding enjoyment in its own triumphs over the material world. It belongs to the artist and the poet to strengthen this bond of art and morality by the culture of the ideal, and to enrich the sentiment of the beautiful by all that is noble in the human heart. But the beauty of art in turn reacts beneficially upon nobleness of heart and thought. Accordingly Schiller has lovingly conceived the idea of the *Esthetic Education of Man*, and has developed it in a series of letters which are the most important of his philosophical writings.

If any man could justify the supremacy that Schiller the philosopher claims for art, whose empire alone, he thinks, should harmoniously develop all our powers, it is Schiller the poet. Possessing this love of the poetical and moral ideal, he unites a virgin delicacy of feeling and taste with the power of creating the most manly types. The *Marquis of Posa*, *Max Piccolomini*, *Thecla*, *Joan of Arc*, *Mary Stuart*, and *William Tell*, are emanations of this light. Its reflection irradiates characters less pure but still poetic, such as *Philip II*, *The Queen*, *The Grand Inquisitor*, the two brothers of the *Bride of Messina* and *Wallenstein*. The same fascination enriches the personages of the ballads *Rudolph of Hapsburg and the Prophetess Cassandra*, *The Diver and the Knight of Soggenburgh*. An ideal splendor illumines the sphere of the ideas, no less than the theater of action of the men and events.

His personified and deified Beauty seems herself to have descended from the skies, to place in the hands of Schiller the celestial cornucopia from which he scatters so many beautiful thoughts. These thoughts embrace in their vast circle all the aspects of life, the immensity of the human heart. They carry you easily from sublimity to purity, from strength to grace, as in the poem in which he sings the *Worth of Woman*. No one has spoken of woman with a deeper and more pleasing

sensibility, or has created more angelic types under feminine features, or has sung upon the lyre more enthusiastically and delicately of these companions of our existence.

The ideal of Schiller has in it nothing fantastic, and is not the fruit of an imagination warmed by the enjoyment of the artist. Notwithstanding his love of perfect beauty he would not, like our romancists, have established the theory of art for the sake of art, exalting the pride of talent with a superb indifference to ideas.

A complete man, love for man underlies all that he does and wishes. His sensibility and emotions are not to him, as with Goethe, merely an object for the artist's observation; they are associated with his poetic mission, and inspire it even. "I have had little enjoyment in life," he writes, while yet young, "but (and it is of this I am most proud) that little I owe to my heart." And, further on, "O, my soul has need of a new aliment, of better men, of friendship, of attachment, of love." His sociability had its roots in the depths of his nature. What the youth promised the man was, throughout his career, in his social relations and his works. In reading his poetry we feel the thrill of emotion to which Schiller himself yields; he loves all humanity, and would ennoble it to make it happy; his nature being highly sympathetic he always awakens sympathy.

To cite as an example only one of his most popular poems, the *Song of the Bell*, upon how many terrestrial interests does the poet from the height at which he hovers lovingly look down! He passes in review all the phases of human destiny, its joys and its griefs; he has songs for the fireside and for the country. Ask men of whatever condition and situation of life, and they will all have received words of consolation and encouragement from the golden mouth of the poet. And in his ode to *Joy*, a hymn the wings of which carry him to the foot of the throne where

"Beyond the heavens the God of Heaven resides,"

how he is saddened by the miseries of humanity! how he feels for its sufferings!

His idealism is, then, combined with realism in just proportions. He repels only base affections and ignoble intentions. From the elevation of his genius he constantly seeks the virtue

on earth, to encourage it; fallen humanity, to raise it; grief, to pour forth its plaint; domestic happiness, to embellish it.

His private life affords a pleasing commentary on his writings, assisting the just valuation of his spirit. Friendship was one of his liveliest enjoyments. His unreserve in the society of his friends was limited only by decorum. The gayety which animated him, his confiding disposition, the heart-warmth of his friendship, are the charm of his correspondence, especially of his letters to Körner. Nothing can be more charming than the interchange of sentiment found in the letters of Schiller and his family. His father, who had been a military man, and was now chief inspector of the gardens of the Duke of Würtemberg, does not comprehend all the works of the son, but he thinks them good, and enjoys the glory of his child for nearly twenty years; yet in the blaze of that glory the paternal dignity is not lost. From the tenderness and delicacy of his mother, you gather that Schiller, like many another poet, received from the maternal mind one of the richest portions of his heritage. The letters of the brothers are also full of interest. But Schiller should have been seen in the privacy of his own home. All the sweetness he ascribes to woman's heart his own lavished on his wife. With his children he was again a child; his two daughters would climb upon his knees to his embraces; the playmate of his sons, he enjoyed their most childish sports.

There is nothing in the history of German literature more interesting than the slowly developed friendship of Schiller and Goethe. Each year drew the bond closer. Rivals in glory without a shadow of jealousy, they consulted each other, contributed to each other's success, and rejoiced at that success together: theirs was a generous alliance of two powerful minds to elevate their nation by the love of noble poetry. Thanks to the diversity of their talents, each was the complement of the other. If they had not shone together the splendor of the most beautiful age of literature would have been somewhat dimmed.

Genius possesses no means of swaying men more powerful than dramatic poetry. Schiller's career was especially that of a dramatic author; his popularity was due to his lyric poems and tragedies.

The impatience of his poetic ardor to express itself and act

upon others impelled him to the theater while quite young. Having been admitted in 1773, by Duke Charles of Würtemberg, to the military academy established and afterward enlarged by him to a sort of university, under the name of *Karl's Schule*, Schiller there first studied law, but forsook it for medicine when that department was opened. The severe discipline of this school did not allow freedom of action nor the full play of the intellect. But tyranny helps the strong. Schiller took refuge in the world of ideas and the study of literature. At the age of eighteen (in 1777) he composed the *Robbers*, and read it in secret to his fellow-students. It was an explosion of his repressed feelings and seething imagination: many of its allusions recall the yoke under which his spirit chafed. The drama was printed after he had expunged, by the advice of friends, the most eccentric passages. The public was delighted: in spite of the imperfections of the work it recognized the seal of genius in the vigor and originality of its ideas and language. It had the boldness of thought and warmth of sentiment which then fired spirits on both sides of the Rhine, and were to flame forth in the French revolution.

The Baron of Dalberg, director of the theater of Mannheim, which stood in the first rank as having the great actor and dramatic poet Iffland, easily obtained a few emendations from Schiller, and put his piece upon the stage in 1782. The young poet was at that time attached to the army as a surgeon. In his anxiety to witness his own play, he left Stuttgard without permission, to be present at the two first representations. Upon his return he was put under a fortnight's arrest for this infringement of discipline. The Duke, displeased with the tendency of the drama, by an edict forbade the author's publishing anything that had not reference to medicine. Schiller quitted Stuttgard secretly, and repaired under an assumed name to Franconia, near Meiningen, to the estate of Madame Wolzogen, whose sons had been his fellow-pupils. He remained there nearly a year, finished *Fiesco* and composed *Love and Intrigue*. With these dramas he went to Mannheim and entered upon an engagement to write for that theater. His two new pieces established the great reputation the *Robbers* had gained him. The three together form the first period of his career.

His idea of art having been refined and expanded during the prosecution of these labors, Schiller in 1784 undertook the publication of a journal, *Thalia*, intended for the improvement of the theater, and composed *Don Carlos*. This was a tragedy, and the first successful attempt to introduce upon the German stage the iambic verse of the Greek tragedy. Besides the pathos of its passion and the interest of its characters, the author unfolds in it the principles of the French philosophy of the eighteenth century on the rights of the people and tolerance. The work lacks unity of plan and interest; begins in one system and continues in another; but in spite of these and other faults, which the poet himself conscientiously points out in his letters on *Don Carlos*, Schiller, in producing it, endowed Germany with pathetic, eloquent, ideal and historical, powerful and poetic tragedy. This was in 1792.

Don Carlos forms the transition from the first dramatic period of Schiller to that of his maturity. While writing it, his genius was especially ripened by the study of history. He made thorough researches for it into the times and reign of Philip II. The *History of the Revolt of the Netherlands* was the direct result of this study. This excellent work was well received by all classes, and gained the author, with the aid of Goethe, the chair of history at the University of Jena. He entered upon his duties at this seat of learning in May, 1789. Two years after appeared the *History of the Thirty Years' War*; it had a similar origin to the composition of Wallenstein, and its success was not less brilliant. The genius of the poet in the service of truth rendered Schiller's histories popular, and he was followed by an improved class of historians.

When the tragedy of Wallenstein appeared (in 1798 and '99) its truthful and poetic painting of the condition and customs of Germany in the first part of the seventeenth century, its life-like hero, whose worldly ambition seeks support in the supernatural, the noble and the corrupt characters surrounding him, delighted the spectators, awakened universal enthusiasm, and naturalized grand and ideal tragedy in Germany. Wallenstein was not only a new palm for the brow of the poet, but the triumph of elevated poetry over the low grade of realism that under Kotzebue and others then prevailed at the theater.

Germany acknowledged her great tragic poet. Schiller fixed his residence at Wiemar.

The poet, if worthy of the name, treats history as he does nature, with a respectful liberty, making choice of what he will reproduce. Schiller's idealization was not transformation, nor always embellishment, but the presentation of each thing and character in its supreme idea, and the showing, in the combination of these realities, of the reign of tragic destiny in its terror. He has effected this in part in his *Mary Stuart.* If he painted her more beautiful than reality, it was because he had chosen her for his heroine and must make her interesting by lessening her perversity. The other characters are not overdrawn; their vices represent the ideas and passions that divided England.

After Mary Stuart, the poet chose another woman for the heroine of a tragedy; Joan of Arc. This was a subject different to treat at the close of the eighteenth century. The best society and literature were impregnated with the sneering philosophy of the French, and the courts, not excepting the enlightened court of Weimar, knew the Maid of Orleans only by Voltaire's poem.

Perhaps the coarse jests of Voltaire caused Schiller to place Joan of Arc in a higher sphere than he would do now. If he had written his drama after the publication of the documents on the life of Joan and had known the depositions of cotemporary witnesses, he would have discarded all supernatural marvel and kept to that of history. The destiny that in his tragedy hovers over Joan of Arc, whether it conducts her miraculously to victory, or lets her fall to the condition of simple woman, is impressed with sadness and grandeur; but we think it less touching than the real facts. Yet history lent brilliancy to this drama; the pictures of combats, of the misery of France, of domestic life, and of devotion in the field, are the most brilliant parts of this poem. Schiller had never before so enchanted the imagination.

In the *Bride of Messina*, the poet, already so varied, almost rivals Greek tragedy in pathos and the terror of fatalism. He never, perhaps, came nearer to it in perfection of composition.

Many persons regard William Tell as Schiller's dramatic

masterpiece, misled by the fascination under the spell of which the author himself composed it. The simplicity of the men and manners, the beauty of the scenery, and the strong characters which he described, the primitiveness of nature and the originality of the subject, carried Schiller's enthusiasm to an unwonted pitch. There was less need of skillful combinations to chain the attention of the spectators. They passed with delight from one to another of the rural, heroic, charming, touching and sublime scenes, without asking for their artistic disposition. The sentiments most natural to the human heart dropping from the lips of the Swiss mountaineers in words of untaught eloquence, wrought up their sympathies to the highest. If some of the personages did stray into an order of ideas superior to their time or station, if Gessler reasoned too much like a systematic oppressor and Tell justified himself in the manner of a philosopher and even somewhat as a sophist, rapture prevented criticism.

With whatever severity we criticize the faults of his pieces, one glory is forever assured to Schiller, that of having created the great tragedy of Germany and remaining unrivaled in it.

Notwithstanding that murmurs of admiration, forerunners of his renown, often reached the ear of the painter of Wallenstein, Schiller's ardor was sometimes dampened by discouragement, and he doubted his calling, even for tragedy; then cheering up, he supplied by the obstinacy of labor the gifts he thought nature had refused him. Comparison of himself with his ideal rendered him modest. This modesty, which even partook of timidity, was known and respected by the public. In a city where he supposed himself unknown he went to see his *Maid of Orleans* played. Some one betrayed his name; it was circulated in a whisper through the hall. Schiller was one of the last to go out. He found the crowd of spectators collected before the theater; it opened to give him passage. There was no applause, no bravo; but all heads were uncovered in respectful silence.

As a great poet, Schiller could not be a stranger to any human or social interest. Politics occupied his vast intellect in so far as it lays down general principles for the liberties of the nation; but he was a stranger to questions of modes of application, forms of government, and balance of power; he

directed his attention to the universal laws of society and offered his incense to the sacred liberty of souls. When Schiller proclaimed love for man, love for nations, tolerance, and liberty of speech, he said in other terms, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." In this noble sense Schiller was to the theater, as in all other fields of thought, the herald of liberty.

The question of Schiller's religion is an interesting one, and quite in place in these pages. His youth was coincident with a time of general irreligion. Voltairean ideas were not less prevalent in Germany than in France, and not less fashionable in other courts than in that of Frederick II.; from high society they descended to other classes. Schiller speaks of the universal ridicule of the sacred writings in his preface to the *Robbers*, and "trusts to have avenged religion and morality in a striking manner by giving over these mockers of Scripture to the indignation of the world in the persons of his most detestable brigands." Voltaireism shed its baneful influence even upon theology. The famous exegete, Paul of Heidelberg, who was Professor at Jena at the same time with Schiller as an expositor of the Gospel, was but a less witty Voltaire. The theologians of Germany, as a class, dazzled and intimidated by Voltaire, as were many French preachers of the day, lowered Christianity, or diluted it in vague generalizations. They destroyed the substance of the religion of Christ and left only its externals standing. Opposed to these were a few exceptions, energetic defenders of Jesus Christ; but a restless melancholy and morose pietism, and a narrow sectarianism, were more frequent. Large and luminous Christianity was little apparent even to an intelligence like that of Schiller.

The young poet, urged on by a philosophic need of harmony, took refuge in ancient Greece, where he thought he found the life of the senses in accord with that of the intellect, the free play of the heart's affections with enjoyment of the fine arts, the exigencies of philosophy with the delights of poetry; and in imbibing the Greek spirit he adopted the mythology of Greece for the religion of his imagination.

This attachment to the promises of nature and the rights of the present life, and the conviction that the Christian religion at times excludes the mere love of beauty, concurred

with other causes to divert still further from it a spirit so worthy to understand it, and so capable of appreciating its essential beauty. During his intimacy with Goethe he went so far as to pursue Christianity with bitterness: there are even times when his correspondence with Goethe exhibits him attacking the historical parts of the Bible.

This estrangement from Christianity was detrimental to the poet, depriving him of many serene, touching, and consoling inspirations. In a poem, highly and justly admired in other respects, what has he said of the religious employment of the bell? A few words of colorless deism. And yet is not its sublimest use that which the Christian Church has given it? The philosopher might ignore this, but the poet should remember it.

When Schiller considers the destiny of man, the doctrine he has wrought out for himself does not impart to him consolation, or give him calm. Wishing to enjoy the present, he finds himself obliged to sacrifice it for the future: he then falls back upon resignation, but his resignation is sad. He who had sung so well of joy in its highest sense, though with somewhat melancholy accents, sees only the hardship of the sacrifice to which he submits, for Christianity alone can accomplish it with joy: only Christianity can re-establish the harmony of our existence.

But the man was better than his doctrine. The impressions he had received from his early religious instruction were not all effaced. His first poem had been inspired by the near approach of his first communion. It had pained him to yield his taste for theology and the pastoral calling to the demands of family interests. In his correspondence with Körner, in which his inmost feelings are most fully discovered, he speaks of the soul, of God and Providence, with as much warmth as the vicar of Savoy, and of prayer with more confidence in its efficacy. The *Song to Joy* is a hymn to the Father of men: Schiller had the faith of the heart.

As he advanced in the career of thought and occupied himself less with the historical element of Christianity, he grew to sympathize more with its moral idealism. The Christian religion appeared to him as replacing the law, the *impératif catégorique* of Kant, by a free inclination for good, the reign of moral beauty in the outward life, and holiness in the heart.

A more complete religious progress is revealed to us in his poems of the last period, the idea of eternity as opposed to the transitoriness of human affairs and the deceptions of life finding a larger place in them. Old age does not explain this change, for Schiller died in his forty-sixth year; neither can we attribute it to the failure of his health, for he had been an invalid fifteen years; besides, his latest productions bear the impress of the energy and lucidity of his mind. It was a religious development in accordance with his character. Always affectionate, careful and delicate in his family and friendly relations, he was so in a still higher degree in the last months of his life. "At that time," says one of his biographers, "the sanction of religion seemed to rest on all his life. Supporting pain with a heroic patience and evenness of disposition, he was the most amiable of men throughout his illness." "An inexpressible sweetness," writes the sister of his wife, "pervaded his entire being, and manifested itself in his judgments and feelings: the peace of God abode with him."

As his end approached he thought of it with concern only with respect to provision for his family. On the eighth of May, 1805, toward evening, he asked to have the curtains raised that he might see the setting sun; he looked upon its last beams lovingly; it was his farewell to nature. To the inquiry as to how he felt, "Better and better, more and more serene," he replied. He prayed several times in the night that his death might not be lingering. He expired the next morning. When he had breathed his last, a celestial peace seemed to glorify his countenance.

The news of his death cast a gloom over all Weimar. Every family seemed afflicted. The premature departure of the great poet was universally deplored.

Considering his career as a whole, Schiller stands as the complete representative of intellectual Germany. His idealism, his seriousness and moral warmth, reflect the best instincts of his nation. It is true that in the high classes of literature, aristocracy of intellect and taste places Goethe as a poet and artist above Schiller; but Schiller is much more the man for all classes. His popularity is unrivaled. The Germans commonly call Goethe "the prince of poets," and Schiller "our poet." The common people may not always understand him,

but in reading him they have a perception of a grandeur that elevates them, and of the love borne them by a mind of the first order and truly sovereign. Everybody retains in both memory and heart some thoughts of Schiller's which encourage, console, and fortify, and raise the spirit above the clouds into a pure heaven. Thus his is the highest praise that can be awarded genius: that he has exalted his nation by the diffusion of great ideas. How enviable that fame which is continued from generation to generation in the *love of all things true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report, in which there is virtue, and which are worthy of praise!*

Art. VI.—EARLY METHODISM AND EARLY AMERICA: JAMES WATT AND JOHN WESLEY.

In the year 1757 John Wesley, traveling and preaching, night and day, throughout the United Kingdom, arrived in Glasgow. He "walked to its College, saw the new library, with the collection of pictures," and admired examples of the art of Raphael, Vandyke, and Rubens. Had he possessed the foresight of the Hebrew seers, he would have paused, as he crossed the University quadrangle, to admire a coming and nobler proof of genius; for it was in this same year that a young man, obscure, diffident, but with a mind burdened with mighty anticipations, and destined to become recognized as a chief benefactor of the human race, came to Glasgow to seek employment as an artisan, where failing to find it among the citizens, he found sympathy in the learned Faculty of the University, and was allowed a humble chamber within its walls. The room is reached from the quadrangle by a spiral stairway, and is still preserved, in its original rudeness, as too sacred to be altered. In the court below, he put out a sign as "Mathematical Instrument Maker to the University." He lived on poor fare, and eked out his subsistence by combining, with his work for the Faculty, the manufacture of musical instruments; he made organs, and repaired flutes, guitars, and violins; but, mean-

while, studied assiduously the laws of physics, that he might apply them in an invention which was to produce the "greatest commercial and social revolution in the entire history of the world,"* a revolution with which Methodism was to have important relations.

After some years of struggle with want, sickness, the treachery of men, and the disappointment of his hopes, James Watt, the young artisan of Glasgow University, gave to the world the Steam-Engine, and to-day the aggregate steam power of Great Britain alone equals the manual capability for labor of more than four hundred millions of men: more than twice the number of males capable of labor on our planet.† Its aggregate power throughout the earth is equal to the male capacity, for manual work, of five or six worlds like ours. The commerce, the navigation, the maritime war, the agriculture, the mechanic arts of his race have been revolutionized by the genius of this young man. His invention was introduced into Manchester about seventy years ago, but now, in that city and its vicinity, are more than fifty thousand boilers with an aggregate power of a million horses.

The invention of the steam-engine was more important to the new than to the old world. It was vastly important to the latter, through the former, for it was the potent instrument for the opening of the boundless interior of the North American continent to the emigration of the European populations, and the development of that immense commerce which has bound together and enriched both worlds,‡ and by which New York city alone now exceeds, in amount of tonnage, more than twice over, all the commercial marine of Great Britain in the year before Watt's invention.§

The great rivers of the new world, flowing with swift cur-

* Quarterly Review, London, 1858.

† Emerson (English Traits, chap. x,) enlarges the estimate a third: "Equal to six hundred millions of men, one man being able, by the aid of steam, to do the work which required two hundred and fifty men to accomplish fifty years ago."

‡ As late as 1784 an American vessel took to Liverpool eight bales of cotton; the custom officers did not believe they could have come from America, and seized them as contraband. In 1857 Liverpool imported a million and a half bales of cotton from the United States. Lond. Quart. Review, 1859.

§ Compare article "Watt," in Appleton's Biographical Encyclopedia, with Bancroft's History of the United States, vol. v, p. 159.

rent, could convey their barges toward the sea, but admitted of no return. The invention of Watt, applied by the genius of Fulton, has conquered their resistance, and opened the grand domain of the Mississippi valley for the formation of mighty states in a single generation, and marshaled the peoples of Europe to march into the wilderness in annual hosts of hundreds of thousands.

Wesley, who might have noticed, in the quadrangle of Glasgow University, the struggling and dependent man whose destiny it was to achieve these stupendous changes, was himself actually preparing the only means that could supply the sudden and incalculable moral wants which they were to create. Methodism, with its "lay ministry" and its "itinerancy," could alone afford the ministrations of religion to the overflowing population; it was to lay the moral foundations of many of the great states of the West. The older Churches of the colonies could never have supplied them with "regular," or educated pastors, in any proportion to their rapid settlement. And in the sudden growth of manufacturing cities, in both England and America, Methodism was to find some of the most urgent necessities for its peculiar provisions.

Watt and Wesley might well, then, have struck hands and bid each other godspeed at Glasgow in 1757: they were co-workers for the destinies of the new world.

The rapid settlement of the continent, especially after the Revolution, presented, indeed, a startling problem to the religious world. Philosophers, considering only its colonial growth, anticipated for it a new era in civilization. Hume perceived there "the seeds of many a noble state; an asylum for liberty and science." Montesquieu predicted for it freedom, prosperity, and a great people; Turgot, that "Europe herself should find there the perfection of her political societies and the firmest support of her well-being." Berkeley pointed to it as the seat of future empire. Locke and Shaftesbury studied out a constitutional polity for a part, at least, of its empire. The fervid spirit of Edwards, seeing, with Bossuet, in all history only the "History of Redemption," dreamed, in his New England retirement, of a millennium which was to dawn in the new world, and thence burst upon the nations and irradiate the globe. The coming Revolution was discerned, and its vast

consequences anticipated by sagacious minds, a half-century before the declaration of Independence. The frequent Indian wars, and especially the "Old French War," concluded but twelve or thirteen years before the Revolution, trained the whole manhood of the colonies to arms, and prepared it to cope with the veteran military strength of the mother country. The treaty of Peace in 1763 was virtually a treaty of American Independence. It gave to England the dominion of the continent, excepting the south-western Spanish possessions, from Baffin's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, from ocean to ocean. It was impossible that this vast colonial domain should long continue under foreign rule. Choisuel, the astute minister of Louis XV., seeking to retain a remnant of the French-American territory, suggested to the English cabinet the importance of the French jurisdiction in Canada, to keep alive in the Anglican colonies a sense of dependence on British protection, and failing of his design, yielded readily, exclaiming, "We have caught them at last!" France, by alliance with the revolting colonies, was to wreak full retribution on her ancient enemy.

The Revolution verified these anticipations, and in its train came events quite anomalous in the religious history of nations. No Protestant prelate had hitherto lived upon the continent; but now it was to present not only a Church without a bishop, and a state without a king, but a state territorially larger than any other in the civilized world without an ecclesiastical establishment. The State, still honoring the Church, separated from it, enfranchising it by divorcing it. Religion was to expect no more legal support, except temporarily, in a few localities where the old system might linger in expiring. The novel example was contrary to the traditional training of all Christian states, and might well excite the anxiety of Christian thinkers for the moral fate of the new world. How was Christian education, Churches, and pastors to be provided for this boundless territory and its multiplying millions of souls? If the "voluntary principle" were as legitimate as its advocates believed, yet could it possibly be adequate to the moral wants of the ever-coming armies of population which, under the attractions of the new country, were about to pour in upon and overspread its immense regions; armies far surpassing the northern hordes whose surging migrations swept away the

Roman empire, and with which was to be transferred to the new world much of the worst barbarism of the old?

The colonial training of the country had been, providentially, to a great extent religious, as if preparatory for its future history.

Puritanism, with whatever repulsive characteristics, had produced in New England the best example of a commonwealth, in the true sense of that term, which the civilized world had yet seen: the best in morals, intelligence, industry, competence, and household comfort; a people to whom the Church and the school-house were as indispensable as their homes. "We all," they declared in the "oldest of American written constitutions," "we all come into these parts of America to enjoy the liberties of the Gospel in purity and peace." "He that makes religion as twelve and the world as thirteen has not the spirit of a New England man." Protestant missions were to have their birth there: the colonial provision, in 1736, for "preaching the Gospel to the Indians" was "the first united Protestant missionary effort in behalf of the heathen world." It preceded by a generation that of the Dutch, in Ceylon, under the auspices of their East India Company. It led to the formation of a Society for Missions among the English nonconformists, which again led, according to Bishop Burnet, to the organization of the "Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge" in the national Church. In thirty-five years after King James's translation of the Bible, Massachusetts gave it, through Eliot, to her Indians—the first Bible printed in America. The healthful influence of New England was to permeate the whole country. It was to give from its pure and hardy stock one third of the white population of the nation, and especially to extend its race and type of character over all the northern tier of states, from the Atlantic to beyond the Mississippi. Rhode Island was settled by the Baptists for "soul liberty." If the Dutch colony of New York was founded chiefly in commercial designs, still it represented the principles of the Protestant Reformation. West New Jersey and Pennsylvania were settled by the Quakers in the best spirit of their peaceful faith. Delaware was colonized by the Swedes; Gustavus Adolphus, the Scandinavian hero of Protestantism, designed the colony, and designed it to be "a blessing to the whole Protestant world." He fell fighting

for his faith at Lützen, but left the design to Oxenstiern, who zealously promoted it, declaring that its "consequences would be favorable to all Christendom, to Europe, to the whole world." The descendants of the settlers have been scattered over the country, and constitute probably one part in two hundred of its population.* If the United States have verified the prediction of Oxenstiern, the Swedes have worthily shared in its accomplishment. Maryland was settled by Roman Catholics with a religious design, for religious liberty, and with a spirit, on the part of its founder, befitting such a design. When the settlers, led by the son of Baltimore, first landed, they "took possession of the province 'for their Saviour' as well as for their lord the King!" The cavalier colonists of Virginia, if not very admirable examples of their religion, nevertheless promptly introduced the Church of the parent land. The first legislature, chosen by the people, established the Church, and the next year it had a pastor for every six hundred of its population. The colonies of the Carolinas, with less religious interest, felt the religious influence of the older settlements, being founded chiefly by emigrants from Virginia and New England, with a wholesome infusion of Quaker, Irish and Scotch Presbyterian, and Huguenot blood and virtue. The Huguenots, encouraged by Coligny, first attempted the colonization of South Carolina for the enjoyment of their religion. They gave the name of their king, Charles IX., to the Carolinas. They failed, but their Protestant countrymen have not failed to constitute an important increment of the population of the states which have grown from the two colonies, as, also, of the Atlantic states generally from New York to Georgia. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes they came, in large numbers, to America, and the Carolinas were their favorite refuge. They brought with them "the virtues of the Puritans without their bigotry." Georgia was colonized by Protestant Englishmen, highland Scots, and Moravians, as "the place of refuge for the distressed people of Britain and the persecuted Protestants of Europe." The Jew was admitted, though not the Papist. The two Wesleys accompanied thither its founder, the benevolent Oglethorpe, the friend of their father and the friend of all men. It was Whitefield's

* Bancroft's estimate for 1837, vol. iii, chap. 15.

favorite resort among the colonies. It interdicted spirituous liquors and slavery. The Cap of Liberty was on its seal; and its motto—*Non sibi sed aliis*, Not for themselves but others—declared the philanthropic purpose of its projectors.*

Thus were most of the colonies founded in religious motives, their infancy moulded by religion, their adolescence invigorated and hardened by war—the preparation for their independence and liberty, and for a new civilization which should be based on the sovereignty of the people, and should emancipate the new world from the ecclesiastical and political traditions of the old.

But now came a solemn crisis in the history of these providentially trained populations, scattered almost from the frozen zone to the tropics, treading a virgin soil of exhaustless resources, and flushed with the consciousness of a new development of humanity. Their territory was to enlarge more than two thirds; their population beyond any recorded example. If, in their colonial growth, Edwards, inspired by the "Great Awakening," saw the vision of the millennium flashing upon their mountains and valleys, the Revolution and the national consolidation, endowing them with new and unexampled powers, oppressed them with new problems. A state may exist without a king, a Church without a bishop, a nation without an ecclesiastical establishment; but a people cannot be without religion, without God; they had better cease to be. And where now, with a political system which recognized no one religion by recognizing all, which made no provision for the spiritual wants of the people, should men who believed religion to be the fundamental condition of civil righteousness and liberty look for the safety of the marvelous destiny that had opened upon the new world?

The Revolution ended with the treaty of peace in 1783, and then commenced a national progress never anticipated in the most sanguine dreams of statesmen. The inventive genius of Watt and Fulton was to wave a wand of miraculous power over the land; and not only the Valley of the Mississippi, stretching over twenty degrees of latitude and thirty of longi-

* "It is remarkable that in every charter granted to the Southern colonies the 'propagation of religion' is mentioned as one of the reasons for the planting of them." Baird: Religion in America, book ii, p. 6.

tude, with twelve millions of souls in our day, was to open, like a new world, to navigation and settlement; but the nearly seven thousand miles of "principal rivers" flowing into the Atlantic, the nearly five thousand flowing into the Gulf of Mexico, the eighteen thousand flowing into the Mississippi—the sea river; the five thousand flowing into the Pacific; the thirty-five thousand miles of principal rivers—above a third more than the circumference of the globe; besides the minor streams, making, with the former, more than forty thousand miles of navigable waters, were to be thrown open as the highways of population and commerce. The masses of Europe, in millions, were to enter these highways. The growth of population was to transcend the most credulous anticipations. The one million and a quarter (including blacks) of 1750, the less than three millions of 1780, were to be nearly four millions in 1790; nearly five and a third millions in 1800, more than nine and a half millions in 1820; nearly thirteen millions in 1830. Thus far they were to increase nearly thirty-three and a half per cent. in each decade. Pensioners of the war of the Revolution were to live to see the "Far West" transferred from the valleys of Virginia, the eastern base of the Pennsylvania Alleghanies, and the center of New York, to the great deserts beyond the Mississippi; to see mighty states enriching the world, flourishing on the Pacific coast, and to read in New York news sent the same day from San Francisco. Men, a few at least, who lived when the population of the country was less than three millions, were to live when it should be thirty millions. If the ratio of increase should continue, this population must amount, at the close of our century, but thirty-six years hence, to one hundred millions; exceeding the present population of England, France, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, and Denmark. A step further in the calculation presents a prospect still more surprising: by the year 1930, which not a few living in our day shall see, this mighty mass of commingled races will have swollen to the aggregate of two hundred and forty-six millions, nearly equaling the present population of all Europe.

This growth of population, could it take place in an old country, supplied for ages with religious and educational foundations, would present anxious moral questions to the reflections

of the philosopher and Christian; but here it was to occur in the wildernesses of savage life. "Westward the star of empire takes its way," sang Berkeley as he contemplated the grand prospect; to the West this overwhelming flood was to sweep, and thither was to move with it the power of the nation, the political forces which were to take their moral character from these multitudes and impart it to the nation, if not to much of the rest of the world. The center of "representative population" has continually tended westward. In 1790 it was twenty-two miles east of Washington; it has never been east of the national metropolis since, and never can be again. At the census of 1800 it had been transferred thirty miles west of Washington; in 1820 it was seventy-one miles west of that city; in 1830 one hundred and eight miles. Its westward movement from 1830 to 1840 was no less than fifty-two miles; more than five miles a year. During about fifty years it has kept nearly the same parallel of latitude, having deviated only about ten miles southward, while it has advanced about two hundred miles westward. Thus were the political destinies of the country to move into the "Great West," the arena of its moral and religious struggles.

Obviously then the ordinary means of religious instruction; a "settled" pastorate, a "regular" clergy, trained through years of preliminary education, could not possibly meet the moral exigencies of such an unparalleled condition. Any contingencies hanging over the federal organization or unity of the nation could hardly affect these exigencies except to exasperate them. A religious system, energetic, migratory, "itinerant," extempore, like the population itself, must arise, or demoralization, if not barbarism, must overflow the continent.

Methodism entered the great arena at the emergent moment. It was preparing to do so while Wesley stood in the quadrangle at Glasgow beneath the window within which Watt was preparing the key to unlock the gates of the Great West. In the very next year Wesley was to find the humble man who was to be its founder in the United States. About the same time a youth, in Staffordshire, was preparing, through many moral struggles, to become its chief leader and the chief character in the ecclesiastical history of the new world, the first resident bishop of Protestantism in the western hemisphere. Method-

ism was not to supersede there other forms of faith, but to become their pioneer in the opening wilderness and to prompt their energies for its pressing necessities. It was to be literally the founder of the Church in several of the most important new states, individually as large as some leading kingdoms of the old world. It was to become at last the dominant popular faith of the country, with its standard planted in every city, town, and almost every village of the land. Moving in the van of emigration, it was to supply, with the ministrations of religion, the frontiers from the Canadas to the Gulf of Mexico, from Puget's Sound to the Gulf of California. It was to do this indispensable work by means peculiar to itself; by districting the land into circuits, which, from one hundred to five hundred miles in extent, could each be statedly supplied with religious instruction by but one or two traveling evangelists, who, preaching daily, could thus have charge of parishes comprising hundreds of miles and tens of thousands of souls. It was to raise up, without delay for preparatory training, and thrust out upon these circuits thousands of such itinerants, tens of thousands of local or lay preachers and exhorters as auxiliary and unpaid laborers, with many thousands of class-leaders who could maintain over the infant societies pastoral supervision, in the absence of the itinerant preachers, who would not have time to delay in any locality for much else than the public services of the pulpit. Over all these circuits it was to maintain the watchful jurisdiction of traveling presiding elders, and over the whole system the superintendence of traveling bishops, to whom the entire nation was to be a common diocese. It was to govern the whole field by quarterly conferences for each circuit, annual conferences for groups of circuits, quadrennial conferences for all the annual conferences. It was to preach night and day, in Churches where it could command them, in private houses, school-houses, court-houses, barns, in the fields, on the highways. It was to dot the continent with chapels, building them, in our times at least, at the rate of one a day. It was to provide academies and colleges exceeding in number, if not in efficiency, those of any other religious body of the country however older or richer. It was to scatter over the land cheap publications, all its itinerants being authorized agents for their sale, until its "Book Concern" should become

the largest religious publishing house in the world. The best authority for the moral statistics of the country, himself of another denomination, was at last to "recognize in the Methodist economy, as well as in the zeal, the devoted piety and the efficiency of its ministry, one of the most powerful elements in the religious prosperity of the United States, as well as one of the firmest pillars of their civil and political institutions."* The Historian of the Republic has recorded that it has "welcomed the members of Wesley's society as the pioneers of religion;" that "the breath of liberty has wafted their messages to the masses of the people; encouraged them to collect the white and negro, slave and master, in the greenwood, for counsel on divine love and the full assurance of grace; and carried their consolation and songs and prayers to the furthest cabins in the wilderness."†

It has been said that Methodism thus seems to have been providentially designed more for the new world than for the old. The coincidence of its history with that of the United States does indeed seem providential; and if such an assumption might have appeared presumptuous in its beginning, its historical results, as impressed on all the civil geography of the country and attested by the national statistics, now amply justify the opinion. Here, if anywhere, the results of Methodism appear to confirm the somewhat bold assertion of a philosophic thinker, not within its pale, who affirms "that, in fact, that great religious movement has, immediately or remotely, so given an impulse to Christian feeling and profession, on all sides, that it has come to present itself as the starting-point of our modern religious history; that the field-preaching of Wesley and Whitefield, in 1739, was the event whence the religious epoch, now current, must date its commencement; that back to the events of that time must we look, necessarily, as often as we seek to trace to its source what is most characteristic of the present time; and that yet this is not all, for the Methodism of the past age points forward to the next-coming development of the powers of the Gospel."‡

But what was this phenomenon of modern religious history,

* Baird: Religion in America, p. 497. † Bancroft, vol. vii, p. 261.

‡ Isaac Taylor's Wesley and Methodism: Preface.

this "religious movement of the eighteenth century called Methodism?"

It was not a new dogmatic phase of Protestantism. They err who would interpret its singular history by its theology. Its prominent doctrine of justification by faith was the prominent doctrine of the Reformation. Its doctrines of the "witness of the Spirit" and of "sanctification" had been received, substantially, if not with the verbalism of Methodism, by all the leading Churches of Christendom.* Wesley, Fletcher, and Sellon appealed to the standards of the Anglican Church in support of their teachings in these respects. Wesley taught no important doctrine which is not authorized by that Church, unless it be what is called his Arminianism. But even this was dominant in the Anglican Church in certain periods of its history. He interpreted its apparently Calvinistic Article by the history of the Articles, and, with many eminent authorities, denied it a strictly Calvinistic significance. Arminianism prevailed in the English Church under the Stuarts. Sancroft, Barrow, Burnet, South, Chillingworth, Cudworth, Bull, More, Hammond, Wilkins, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, were Arminians.† The "Theological Institutes of Episcopius," says an author, but eighteen years before the birth of Wesley, "were generally in the hands of our students of divinity in both universities as the best system of divinity that has appeared."‡ Arminianism had spread, "as is well known, over much of the Protestant regions of Europe. The Lutheran Churches came into it; and in England there was a predisposing bias in the rulers of the Church toward the authority of the primitive fathers, all of whom before the age of Augustine, and especially the Greek, are acknowledged to have been on that side which promoted the growth of this Batavian Theology."§ Arminianism had been tried, then, but with no such results as accompanied it under Methodism. If it be replied that its legitimate influence had been neutralized by the latitudinarian errors associated with it by many of the English divines mentioned, and by its great continental representatives, Grotius, Causabon, Vossius,

* On the general Acceptance of the doctrine of Assurance by the Churches of the Reformation, see Sir William Hamilton's "Discussions on Philosophy," etc., p. 508. London.

† Hallam, "Literature of Europe," vol. ii, p. 287, American edition.

‡ Bull's Works, vol. viii, p. 257. 1838. § Hallam, vol. ii, p. 43.

Le Clerc, Wetstein, and innumerable others, yet it had been taught with evangelical purity by Arminius himself and his immediate associates,* but with no such power as attended Methodism. In fine, none of the important doctrines taught by Wesley and his followers were peculiar to them. That their theology was necessary to their system, of course, cannot be denied; but, we repeat, it was not peculiar to the system. It had existed, every one of its essential dogmas, in the general Church, without the remarkable efficacy of Methodism. Calvinistic Methodism was powerful alike with Arminian Methodism in the outset, and failed at last only by the failure of its ecclesiastical methods. Methodism differed from other religious bodies, in respect to theology, chiefly by giving greater prominence, more persistent inculcation to truths which they held in common, particularly to the doctrines of Justification by Faith, Assurance, and Sanctification. These were the current ideas of Methodist Theology, but they were rendered incandescent by the spirit, and effective by the methods of Methodism.

In these two facts—the spirit, and the practical system of Methodism—inheres the whole secret, if secret it may be called, of its peculiar power.

The "Holy Club" was formed at Oxford in 1729, for the sanctification of its members. The Wesleys there sought personal purification by prayer, watchings, fastings, alms, and Christian labors among the poor. George Whitefield joined them for the same purpose; he was the first to become "renewed in the spirit of his mind;" but not till he had passed through a fiery ordeal, till he had spent "whole days and weeks prostrate on the ground in prayer," "using only bread and sage tea" during "the forty days of Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays." He became morbid in his spiritual earnestness; he lost the power of memory at times; he "selected the coarsest food, wore patched raiment, and uncleaned shoes, and coarse gloves." He prayed "till the sweat ran down his face, under the trees, far into the winter's nights;" but he escaped at last his ascetic delusions, and was saved "by laying

* Professor Stuart, of Andover, says, (Creed, etc., of Arminius, Biblical Repository, vol. i,) "Let the injustice, then, of merging Pelagius and Arminius together no more be done among us, as it often has been." "Most of the accusations of heresy made against him [Arminius] appear to be the offspring of suspicion, or of a wrong construction of his words."

hold on the cross by a living faith;" receiving "an abiding sense of the pardoning love of God, and a full assurance of faith." He was hooted at and pelted with missiles in the streets by his fellow-students, but was preparing meanwhile to go forth a herald of the new "movement:" a preacher of Methodism in both hemispheres; the greatest preacher, it is probable, in popular eloquence, of all the Christian ages.

John and Charles Wesley continue the ineffectual ascetic struggle, poring over the pages of the "Imitatione," and the "Holy Living and Dying;" in all things "living by rule;" fasting excessively; visiting the poor and the prisoner. They find no rest to their souls, untroubled, as yet, by any dogmatic question, but seeking only spiritual life. Wesley proposes to himself a solitary life in the "Yorkshire dales;" "it is the decided temper of his soul." His wise mother interposes, admonishing him prophetically "that God had better work for him to do." He travels some miles to consult "a serious man." "The Bible knows nothing of solitary religion," says this good man, and Wesley turns about with his face toward that great career which was to make his history a part of the history of his country and of the world. "Holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord," is the cry of his spirit; but he still finds it not. "I am persuaded," he writes, "that we may know if we are *now* in a state of salvation, since that is expressly promised in the Holy Scriptures to our sincere endeavors, and we are surely able to judge of our own sincerity." Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying" teaches him utter purity of motive; "instantly he resolves to dedicate *all* his life to God; all his thoughts, and words and actions; being thoroughly convinced there is no medium." The dedication is made, but the light does not come. The two brothers determine to seek it in the wilderness of the new world—to "forsake all," become missionaries to the colonists and savages, and perish in obscurity, if need be, for their souls. They accompany Oglethorpe to Georgia, and on the voyage they witness the joyous faith of Moravian peasants and artisans in the perils of storms; they are convinced that they themselves have no such faith. They question the Moravians, and get improved views of the spiritual life, but still grope in the dark. They learn more from the Moravian missionaries in the colonies, but sink into deeper

anxiety. They preach and read the Liturgy every day to the colonists, and teach their children in schools. They fast much, sleep on the ground, refuse all food but bread and water. John goes barefooted to encourage the poor children who had no shoes. The colonists recoil from their severities, and they return to England defeated. In sight of Land's End John writes in his journal: "I went to America to convert Indians, but O, who shall convert me? who is he that will deliver me from this evil heart of unbelief?" On arriving in England he again writes: "This then have I learned, in the ends of the earth, that I am 'fallen short of the glory of God.' I have no hope but that, if I seek, I shall find Christ." "If," he adds, "it be said that I have faith, for many such things have I heard from many miserable comforters, I answer, so have the devils a *sort* of faith, but still they are strangers to the covenant of promise. The faith I want is a sure trust and confidence in God, that through the merits of Christ my sins are forgiven, and I reconciled to the favor of God."

The Moravians meet him again in London, where they maintain several religious society meetings in private houses. Both the Wesleys, turning away from St. Paul's, Westminister Abbey, the dead Churches, seek light from heaven in these humble assemblies. They become the associates of Peter Böhler, a Moravian preacher. John Wesley cleaves to him. "February 7th, 1738—a day much to be remembered," writes the troubled inquirer when he first meets Böhler; "I did not willingly lose an opportunity of conversing with him." The Moravian expounds to him faith, justification by faith, sanctification by faith; he begins to "see the promise, but it is afar off." He attends a Moravian meeting and hears Luther's Preface to the Epistle to the Romans read: the truth breaks upon his mind; "I felt," he writes, "my heart strangely warmed; I felt I did trust in Christ alone for salvation, and an assurance was given me that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death." Charles Wesley three days before had experienced the same change; "I now," he writes, "found myself at peace with God. I went to bed still sensible of my own weakness; I humbly hope to feel more and more so; yet confident of Christ's protection." Such is "regeneration," according to Methodism; such the first great truth of its proclamation to the world.

The next month John Wesley preaches "Salvation by faith" before the University of Oxford. He has begun his career. The Churches of London are startled by his preaching; by no new truth, but the emphasis and power with which he declares old and admitted truths of the Anglican theological standards, the "new birth," the "witness of the Spirit," and, subsequently, the doctrine of "sanctification," a doctrine which, as taught by Wesley, is in accordance with the highest teachings of the Anglican Church, "is," says a strict churchman, "essentially right and important; combining, in substance, all the sublime morality of the Greek fathers, the spiritual piety of the Mystics, and the divine philosophy of our favorite Platonists. Macarius, Fenelon, Lucas, and all their respective classes, have been consulted and digested by him, and his ideas are essentially theirs."* His doctrine of faith seemed like a new truth to the apathetic formalism of the Church, but it was the doctrine of its Homilies and of its best theologians.†

The genius of Methodism was, then, evangelical life, and in theology, its chief concern was with those doctrines which are essential to personal religious life. "What was the rise of Methodism?" asked Wesley in his conference of 1765. He answered, "In 1729 my brother and I read the Bible; saw inward and outward *holiness* therein; followed after it and incited others so to do. In 1737 we saw this holiness comes by *faith*. In 1738 we saw we must be *justified* before we are sanctified. But still *holiness* was our point; inward and outward holiness. God then thrust us out to raise a *holy* people."

Whitefield had startled the metropolitan Churches before Wesley's arrival, and, flaming with apostolic zeal, had left for Georgia, the vessel which bore him passing in the channel that which brought Wesley; but he soon returned, and now the Methodistic movement began in good earnest. Its apostles were excluded from the pulpits of London and Bristol; they took the open field, and thousands of colliers and peasants stood weeping around them. They invaded the fairs and merry-makings of Moorfields and Kennington Common; ten,

* Knox: "Bishop Webb's Thirty Years' Correspondence," Letter xix.

† "I ventured to avow it, as my conviction, that either Christian faith is what Wesley here describes, or there is no proper meaning in the word." Coleridge: Note to Southey's Life of Wesley, chap. xx.

twenty, sometimes fifty, and even sixty thousand people, made their audiences. Their singing could be heard two miles off, and Whitefield's voice a mile. The lowest dregs of the population were dragged out of the moral mire and purified. The whole country was soon astir with excitement; the peasantry of Yorkshire, the colliers of Kingswood and Newcastle, the miners of Cornwall, gathered in hosts around the evangelists, for they saw that here were at last men, gowned and ordained, who cared for their neglected souls. Societies were organized for their religious training; without, however, the remotest design of forming a sect or creating a schism. Terms of membership in these societies were necessary, and thus originated the "General Rules," a purely catholic document, with not one dogmatic proposition: the terms of Methodist communion throughout the world. Places for their assemblies must be provided, and on the 12th of May, 1739, the foundations of a building were laid in Bristol: the first chapel founded by Methodism in the world. On the 14th of November the "Old Foundry," in London, was opened for worship by Wesley.* Methodism thus early began its edifices, its material fortifications. In this year also its first hymn book, its virtual Liturgy, was published. It is the recognized epoch of the denomination.

The societies need instructors in the absence of the Wesleys, who now begin to "itinerate" through the kingdom, for the clergy will not take charge of them, and exclude them from the communion table. Wesley appoints intelligent laymen to read to them the Holy Scriptures. One of these, Thomas Maxfield, sometimes explains his readings; he is a man of superior talents: the Countess of Huntingdon (now an influential Methodist) hearing him often, encourages him to preach. Wesley, on learning the novel fact, revolts from it, for he is yet a rigid churchman; but his mother knows Maxfield, and warns her son not to resist the providence of God, for she believes this is a providential provision for the great work begun in the land. Wesley at last acknowledges the obvious fact, and thus begins the lay ministry of Methodism, whose ten thousand voices were soon to be heard in most of the ends of the earth. The societies multiply faster than the lay preachers; these must therefore travel from one assembly to another, and thus begins

* The Bristol chapel was begun first, the Foundry opened first.

the "itinerancy." The travels of the itinerants must be assigned definitive boundaries, and thus arises the "circuit system." The societies must provide for their chapel debts and other expenses; the members of that of Bristol are distributed into companies of twelve, which meet weekly to pay their "pennies" to a select member, appointed over each, and thus originates the financial economy of Methodism. They find time, when together, for religious conversation and exhortation, and thus begins the "class meeting," with its "leader," the nucleus of almost every subsequent Methodist society in the world, and a necessary pastoral counterpart to the itinerancy. Many men of natural gifts of speech, who are not able to travel as preachers, appear in the societies; they are licensed to instruct the people in their respective localities, and thus arise the offices of "local preachers" and "exhorters," laborers who have done incalculable service, and have founded the denomination in the United States, the West Indies, Africa, and Australia. Wesley finds it necessary to convene his itinerants annually for consultation and the arrangement of their plans of labor, and thus is founded (June 25, 1744) the annual conference. Several of these bodies have to be formed in the extended field of the Church in the United States, and for their joint action on important measures it becomes necessary to assemble them together once in four years, and thus arises the American General Conference.

Wesley has been pronounced one of the greatest of ecclesiastical legislators,* and the historian of his country has declared that "his genius for government was not inferior to that of Richelieu."† Wesley believed that not himself, but divine Providence legislated the system of Methodism. He devised no system; he but accepted the suggestions of Providence as they seemed evolved in the progress of the movement. To him expediency was a moral law, and nothing expedient that was not morally right. He knew not to what his measures would come; nor was he anxious about the future. As yet he was a stanch churchman: he lived and died loyal to the Anglican Church. The Methodists, he insisted, were not raised up to form a sect, but to spread "scriptural holiness over these

* Buckle's History of Civilization.

† Macaulay's Essays, vol. i, p. 221. Third London Edition.

lands." Their mission being purely spiritual, their practical or disciplinary system was founded purely in their spiritual designs. An Arminian himself, Wesley admitted Calvinists to membership in his societies. "One condition, and only one," he said, "is required—a real desire to save their souls." "I desire," he writes to the Methodistic churchman, Venn, "to have a league, offensive and defensive, with every soldier of Christ." "We do not impose," he declared, "in order to admission, any opinions whatever;" "this one circumstance is quite peculiar to Methodism." "We ask only, 'Is thy heart as my heart? If it be give me thy hand.'" "Is there any other society in Great Britain or Ireland so remote from bigotry?—so truly of a catholic spirit? Where is there such another society in Europe or in the habitable world?" In organizing the Methodist Episcopal Church, he gave it "Articles of Religion" abridged from the English Articles; but he did not insert or require them in the "General Rules," or terms of membership. They were an "indicatory rather than an obligatory" symbol.

Though faithful to the national Church, he saw, in advanced life, that the treatment of his people by the clergy would sooner or later alienate them from the Establishment, but that and all other contingencies he committed to divine Providence. His task was to work while the day lasted; to do the duty nearest to him; God would take care of the rest.

Such then was Methodism—such its spirit and its methods. "It was a revival Church in its spirit; a missionary Church in its organization."*

It spread rapidly over Great Britain, into Scotland, into Ireland, to Nova Scotia, the United States, the West Indies, France, Africa, India, and was to achieve its most remarkable triumphs among the Cannibal Islands of the Southern Ocean. Wesley became almost ubiquitous in the United Kingdom, preaching daily. His lay preachers soon filled the land with the sound of the Gospel. Chapels rose rapidly in most of the country. Hostilities also arose; mobs assailed the itinerants;

* A churchman has declared that when Wesley appeared the Anglican Church was "an ecclesiastical system under which the people of England had lapsed into heathenism, or a state hardly to be distinguished from it;" and that Methodism "preserved from extinction and reanimated the languishing Nonconformity of the last century, which, just at the time of the Methodistic revival, was rapidly in course to be found nowhere but in books."—*Isaac Taylor's Wesley and Methodism*, pp. 56, 59.

their chapels were pulled down; for months, and even for years, riots were of almost constant occurrence. In some sections the rabble moved in hosts from village to village, attacking preachers and people, destroying not only the churches, but the homes of Methodists. In Staffordshire "the whole region was in a state little short of civil war." In Darlaston, Charles Wesley could distinguish the houses of the Methodists by their marks of violence as he rode through the town. At Walsall he found the flag of the rioters waving in the market-place, their head-quarters. In Litchfield "all the rabble of the country was gathered together, and laid waste all before them." The storm swept over nearly all Cornwall. Newcastle was in tumult. In London, even, occurred formidable mobs. In Cork and Dublin they prevailed almost beyond the control of the magistrates. Methodism had, in fine, to fight its way over nearly every field it entered in Great Britain and Ireland. The clergy and the magistrates were often the instigators of these tumults.* Not a few of the itinerants were imprisoned, or impressed into the army and the navy; some were martyred. But the devoted sufferers held on their way till they conquered the mob, and led it by thousands to their humble altars. Howell Harris, amid storms of persecution, planted Methodism in Wales, where it has elevated the popular religious condition, once exceedingly low, above that of Scotland, and has in our day more than twelve hundred churches, Arminian and Calvinistic. Wesley traversed Ireland as well as Great Britain; he crossed the channel forty-two times, making twenty-one visits; and Methodism has yielded there some of its best fruits. Whitefield, known as a Calvinist, and forming no societies, was received in Scotland; his congregations were immense, filling valleys or covering hills, and his influence quickened into life its Churches. He aided Harris in founding Calvinistic Methodism in Wales. The whole evangelical dissent of England still feels his power. With the Countess of Huntingdon

* The cotemporary books of Methodism abound in proofs. Buckle says: "The treatment which the Wesleyans received from the clergy, many of whom were magistrates, shows what would have taken place if such violence had not been discouraged by the government. Wesley has himself given many details, which Southey did not think proper to relate, of the calumnies and insults to which he and his followers were subjected by the clergy." *History of Civilization*, vol. i, p. 304.

he founded the Calvinistic Methodism of Great Britain, but such was the moral unity of both parties, the Arminian and the Calvinistic, that the essential unity of the general Methodistic movement was maintained, awakening to a great extent the spiritual life of both the national Church and of the Nonconformists, and producing most of those "Christian enterprises" by which British Christianity has since been spreading its influence around the globe. The British Bible Society, most of the British Missionary Societies, Tract Societies, the Sunday-school, religious periodicals, cheap popular literature, negro emancipation, Exeter Hall, with its blessings and its follies, all arose directly or indirectly from the impulse of Methodism.

Whitefield crossed the Atlantic thirteen times—journeyed incessantly through the colonies, passing and repassing from Georgia to Maine like a "flame of fire." The Congregational Churches of New England, the Presbyterians and the Baptists of the Middle States, and the mixed colonies of the South, owe their later religious life and energy mostly to the impulse given by his powerful ministrations. The "great awakening" under Edwards had not only subsided before Whitefield's arrival, but had reacted.* Whitefield restored it; and the New England Churches received under his labors an infusion of zeal and energy which has never died out. He extended the revival from the Congregational Churches of the Eastern, to the Presbyterian Churches of the Middle States. In Pennsylvania and New Jersey, where Frelinghuysen, Blair, Rowland, and the two Tennents had been laboring with evangelical zeal, he was received as a prophet from God, and it was then that the Presbyterian Church took that attitude of evangelical power and aggression which has ever since characterized it. These faithful men had begun a humble ministerial school in a log-cabin "twenty feet long and nearly as many broad." "The work was of God," said Whitefield, "and therefore could not come to naught." The fame of Princeton has verified his prediction. "Nassau Hall received a Meth-

* Dr. Holmes says in his American Annals "that the zeal which had characterized the New England Churches of an earlier period had previous to Whitefield's arrival subsided, and a lethargic state ensued." Dr. Chauncey ("Reasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion in New England") declares that the reaction which had set in had depressed the religious condition of the colonies to as low a level as that described in Edwards's Narrative.

calistic baptism at its birth, Whitefield inspirited its founders, and was honored by it with the title of A. M.; the Methodists in England gave it funds; and one of its noblest presidents (Davies) was a correspondent of Wesley, and honored him as a 'restorer' of the true faith." Dartmouth College arose from the same impulse; it received its chief early funds from the British Methodists, and bears the name of one of their chief Calvinistic associates whom Cowper celebrated as "The one who wore a coronet and prayed." Whitefield's preaching, and especially the reading of his printed sermons in Virginia, led to the founding of the Presbyterian Church in that state, whence it has extended to the south and south-west. "The stock from which the Baptists of Virginia and those in all the south and south-west have sprung was also Whitefieldian." The founder of the Freewill Baptists of the United States was converted under the last preaching of Whitefield.

Though Whitefield did not organize the results of his labors, he prepared the way for Wesley's itinerants in the new world. When he descended into his American grave they were already on his tracks. They came not only to labor, but to organize their labors; to reproduce amid the peculiar moral necessities of the new world both the spirit and the methods of the great movement as it had at last been organized by Wesley in the old, and to render it before many years superior in the former in both numerical and moral force to the Methodism of the latter.*

Such is a rapid review of the early development both of the United States and of Methodism preparatory for those extraordinary advancements which both have made. The next

* Figures are proverbially veracious. We have authentically the statistics of the leading Christian denominations of the United States for the first half of our century. They attest conclusively the peculiar adaptation of the ecclesiastical system of Methodism to the moral wants of the country. During the period from 1800 to 1850 the ratio of the increase of the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church has been as 6 to 1, of its communicants as 6 to 1; of the ministry of the Congregationalists as 4 to 1, of their communicants as 2⅔ to 1; of the ministry of the regular Baptists as 4 to 1, of their communicants as 5⅔ to 1; of the ministry of the Presbyterians ("old and new schools") as 14 to 1, of their communicants as 8½ to 1; of the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church (north and south) as 19⅔ to 1, of its communicants as 17⅓ to 1. It must be borne in mind, however, that most, if not all these religious bodies, have, during the whole of this period, been more or less pervaded by the Methodistic impulse given by Whitefield and his successors, and much of their success is unquestionably attributable to that fact.

year, as has been remarked, after Wesley stood in the quadrangle of Glasgow University, where Watt, about the same time, hung out his sign, the Methodist apostle stood preaching in the open air, in an obscure village of Ireland, to the people who were destined to form the first Methodist Church in the United States. In two years more they arrived at New York, in six years more they were organized as a society, and thenceforward, coincidently with the opening of the continent by the genius of Watt and Fulton, Methodism has maintained Christianity abreast of the progress of immigration and settlement throughout the states and territories of the Union.

Art. VII.—THE PARSEES.

Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees. By Dr. M. Haug. 8vo. Bombay: 1862.

The Manners and Customs of the Parsees. By Dadabhai Naoroji. Liverpool: 1861.

The Parsee Religion. By Dadabhai Naoroji. Liverpool: 1861.

The Parsees belong at present among the smallest religious denominations of the world, as they amount only to about one hundred thousand in western India, and five thousand five hundred in Yazd and Kirman, making a total of one hundred and five thousand five hundred.* Yet a greater interest is taken in them than in many sects a thousand times their superiors in numbers; for they are remembered as the descendants of that powerful State Church of Persia which, under the first

* Pierer's Real-Encyclopädie, s.v. *Parsen*, (vol. xii, p. 712,) estimates the number of the Parsees in Persia at about 7000, and in India, in 1858, at 150,000. They have greatly decreased during the past century in Persia, as one hundred years ago they still numbered 100,000. In India, on the other hand, they have increased since the occupation of Bombay by England. A hundred years ago there were only 50,000 in Bombay, Surat, and the neighboring region; now (according to Pierer) the island of Bombay alone contains 110,000.

Dr. Petermann, during his journey in Persia, learned from a distinguished Parsee of Bombay that the number of Parsees in India amounted to 300,000. (*Reisen im Orient.* Leipzic: 1861. Vol. ii, p. 179.) The number of Persian Parsees is reported by Petermann to be about 3000 families. (Ibid., p. 203.)

successors of Cyrus, for some time seemed to be destined to become temporarily the religion of the greater part of the globe; and which again, under the Sassanian dynasty, (228–673 A. D.,) assumed such vigor that Shapur II., like another Diocletian, aimed at the extirpation of the Christian faith. Overpowered and almost extirpated by the Mohammedans, they disappeared, as it seems, forever from among the prominent religions of mankind. Their religious condition, like that of all eastern Asia, was almost entirely unknown to the Christian world until, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the celebrated Orientalist, Anquetil du Perron, laid the foundation of a thorough knowledge of their language and literature. Since then, steady progress has been made in the elucidation of their history and religion. Grammars and dictionaries of the ancient language in which their sacred books were written have appeared; the originals of these sacred books and ancient translations into other oriental languages have been published;* valuable information has been obtained from our improved knowledge of the other literatures and languages of the East; and all the material thus gained has been so successfully elaborated, that the Parsees in India themselves have acknowledged their indebtedness to European scholars for the elucidation of their ancient religion.

The works named at the head of our article are the most recent, and belong among the most interesting and valuable productions of Parsee literature. The author of the first, Dr. Martin Haug, is a young German scholar, educated at the Universities of Tübingen, Göttingen, and Bonn, who left his native country about three years ago in order to accept a professorship of Sanscrit at the Indian University of Poona, in Deccan. While in India he soon established a reputation by his profound knowledge of the sacred books of the Parsees. In September, 1861, the Parsees in Bombay arranged in his honor for a great

* There are at present five more or less complete editions of the Zendavesta. The first was lithographed under the supervision of Burnouf, and appeared in Paris 1829–'43. The second edition of the text, in Roman characters, was published by Professor H. Brockhaus, of Leipzic, 1850. The third, in Zend characters, was published by Professor Spiegel, of Erlangen, in 1851; and a fourth one by Professor Westergaard, of Copenhagen, (Copenhagen, 1851–'52.) One or two editions were published in India, with a Gujerati translation. A German translation was published by Professor Spiegel, (Leipzic, 1852–'59,) but it is mostly based on the Pehlevi translations of the original.

meeting, at which their high priests, (desturs,) from sixty to seventy influential members of their community, and some Brahmins, were present. They presented him with a large number of printed books on the religion of the Parsees and kindred subjects, and he had to give them a lecture on their religion, with which they were highly pleased. They also inquired of him whether he did not wish to become president of their ecclesiastical seminary at Bombay, and teach their priests the true contents of the Zendavesta. This remarkable offer was declined for the present, but it is a proof of the great confidence which the Parsees have in the extent and the accuracy of his scholarship. Nearly the whole edition of his works was, in advance, subscribed for by the Parsees and the Englishmen in the presidentship of Bombay. His work, which also embraces a grammar of the Zend language, discusses the primitive religion of the Parsees.

The other two works at the head of our article are mostly devoted to the actual condition of the sect, and have been compiled by a learned Parsee, Dadabhai Naoroji, who was at the time of their publication (1861) Professor of Gujerati in the University of London. The one on the Manners and Customs of the Parsees, is a paper read before the Liverpool Philomathic Society; the other, on the Parsee Religion, was delivered as a lecture before the Liverpool Literary and Philosophical Society. In the following lines we give a condensed account of the works of both the German and the Parsee scholars.

I.—The Origin of the Parsee Religion.

The earliest mention, according to Dr. Haug, of the followers of Zoroaster is found in the prophet Jeremiah, (xxxix, 3,) who speaks of the Magi at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. There is a casual reference to the doctrines of the sect in Ezekiel viii, 16, 17; and Dr. Haug regards it as a remarkable circumstance that Cyrus, the greatest ruler produced by the sect, is called by the prophet Isaiah "an anointed of the Lord." Besides the belief in one God, there are several other points which are common to the Old Testament and the Zendavesta, as the doctrine of Satan and the resurrection of the flesh. The language of the two books, however, shows but few traces of mutual influence. The Zendavesta contains but two foreign

words of Semitic origin, and they do not refer to religious things. On the other hand, the later portions of the Old Testament have a number of Persian words, the most celebrated of which is the word Paradise. The New Testament speaks with high esteem of the "wise men" (Matthew ii) who came from the East to Jerusalem to worship the new-born King of the Jews.

Among the Greeks, Herodotus is commended by Dr. Haug for his accurate knowledge of the sacrificial rites of the Persians. A special work (unfortunately not extant) on the religion of Zoroaster was compiled by Hermippus, who seems to have possessed an extensive knowledge of the ancient Zend literature. Among the Armenian writers, Eznik and Elisæus, two authors of the fifth century, report, that at their time the Parsees were divided into two sects, the Mog, (Magi, Maghava,) who recognized only the Avesta, or the original sacred writings, as obligatory, and lived especially in Media and Persia; and the Zendik, who recognized also the Zend, or the traditional explanations of the Avesta, and were numerous in the East, especially in Bactriana. The Arabic geographers furnish but little light. The learned Massudi put Zoroaster about two hundred and eighty years before Alexander the Great, or about five hundred and sixteen years before Christ; but in this he only follows an erroneous statement of the Persians of the time of the Sassanian dynasty. Another statement of Mohammedan authors, that according to the assertions of the Parsees, Abraham and Zoroaster were one and the same person, probably rest upon an intentional invention of the much-persecuted Parsees, who thus hoped to escape the intolerance of the Mohammedans.

The investigations of European scholars begin with the "History of the Ancient Persian Religion," published in 1700 by Hyde, the celebrated scholar of Oxford. But he only collated what foreign authors had written about the subject. The first European who opened to himself the way to the text of the sacred books is Anquetil du Perron. Being without funds, he went as a sailor to India in order to study the Parsee literature. He remained in India from 1754 to 1761, and upon his return he published a translation of the Zendavesta, with notes and treatises. This work, which is the basis of all modern investi-

gations on Zend, was entirely neglected by the English scholars for half a century, because they were of opinion that the Zendavesta of Anquetil was spurious, and not the work of Zoroaster. Some of the German scholars shared the same opinion, while others defended the work of the Frenchman. After the close affinity of the Zend language with the Sanscrit had been shown in 1826 by the eminent Danish scholar Rask, a great step in advance in our knowledge of the Parsees was made by the French Orientalist Eugene Burnouf, (1829–'43,) who was the first to publish the Zend texts in Europe. It was found, as was to be expected, that the translation of Anquetil was inaccurate in many details; but his description of the rites and ceremonies can even now be regarded as reliable. Anquetil was indebted for all his knowledge of the Zendavesta to the Desturs, or high priests of the Parsees in India, who no longer understood the original language of the Zend texts, but entirely relied upon a translation made in the Pehlevi language, which was spoken in Persia at the time of the Sassanian dynasty. Burnouf sought the key to the old religious books of the Magi in the language of the ancient religious books of India, the Vedas. In this way he was sometimes led astray in his etymologies, but generally found the right, as far as grammatical forms and inflections are concerned. Burnouf was the first who gave a direct translation from the original language of the Zendavesta.

The way thus having been opened by two Frenchmen, German and Danish scholars soon made themselves completely masters of the newly-discovered science. Haug mentions the works of Olshausen, Bopp, (in his Comparative Grammar,) Joseph Müller, Hermann Brockhaus, and with special distinction, of Westergaard, after which he analyzes the merits of Dr. Spiegel. The latter, however, are not valued by Haug as highly as is common among nearly all the great oriental scholars of Europe.

Dr. Haug devoted his attention from the beginning principally to the *Gâtha*, the oldest and noblest portions of the Zendavesta, which had been translated by Anquetil, but the sense of which he had entirely missed, as they had been even to the Parsee priests a sealed book for thousands of years. As a means for obtaining an accurate knowledge of the Gâtha he

studied the Pehlevi, the language of Persia during the reign of the Sassanian dynasty, and in particular the oldest form of Sanscrit. Of special importance for his purpose was the Rig-veda Samhita, a collection of one thousand old Sanscrit hymns. As only the eighth part of it is printed, he copied all the rest. He also compiled for his own use vocabularies of the Zend texts and of the Vedas. Thus prepared, he attempted in 1853 to explain a portion of the second Gâtha. Later (1858–'60) he published the texts of the five Gâtha with a Latin and a German translation; and in the volume of Essays, of which we are treating in this article, he gives, together with other researches, a grammar of the Zend, (pp. 49–119.)

The term Zendavesta is not strictly correct; the proper form is Avesta-Zend. Zend means, not as the Parsee priests explain it, the Pehlevi translation of the Avesta, but in general "interpretation, commentary." The sacred books of the Parsees contain both Avesta and Zend. The Avesta is principally contained in that part which is called Yazna, or (in Pehlevi) Eezeshnee; the rest is mostly Zend. At first Zend embraced only the interpretations of Zoroaster and his disciples; but in the course of time these interpretations were considered as sacred as the text itself, and both together were honored with the name Avesta. At the time of the Sassanian dynasty the old Zendavesta had already become so unintelligible as to require a new Zend. This was the Pehlevi translation. It is only this "Zend" which is understood by the Parsee priests, the old texts being entirely unknown to them. The Avesta-Zend is, however, more than a mere commentary to the Avesta; for the commentary itself produced a number of new doctrines, which were called Zend doctrines, and are mentioned under this title in the first verse of the Bundehesh, a Pehlevi book.

The Zend-Avesta in its present form is a comparatively thin volume. It must have suffered very large losses, for Hermippus affirms that Zoroaster composed two millions of verses, and the Arabic historian Abu Dshafir Attavari maintains that the writings of Zoroaster filled twelve thousand parchments. The sacred volume consisted of twenty-one parts or Nosks, corresponding to the twenty-one words contained in the most holy prayer of the adherents of Zoroaster. Each Nosk contains Avesta and Zend, and of all these pieces we only know the

heading and the contents; only a single one, the twentieth, called the *Vendidad*, and treating of "the removal of all kinds of pollution, by which great injury is done in the world," has been preserved entire. Besides Avesta and Zend, the sacred volume contains also parts called Yazna and Visparad, which cannot have belonged originally to the twenty-one Nosks, but must be of antecedent origin, and which sustain to the remainder of the Nosks about the same relation as the Pentateuch to the Talmud. The Yazna and Visparad have a theological content, while the rest of the Nosks contains every kind of untheological matter, political prescriptions, civil laws, geography, astronomy, medicine, etc. That the origin of the component parts of the sacred writings of Zoroaster belonged to different ages, was already known to the Greeks. The close of the collection fell probably about 400 B. C.; the origin of the most ancient parts ascends, according to Haug, to about 2800 B. C.

Many centuries before the beginning of the Christian era Zoroaster is mentioned as the author of the sacred writings of the Parsees. The tradition of the Parsees says that their prophet was in direct consultation with God, and that he communicated the answers which were given to him to his disciples and his people. It is nowhere mentioned by whom and when the sacred words were written down; probably they were for a long time handed down from generation to generation orally, as even to-day the Brahmins can recite the entire contents of a Veda without missing a single word or a single accent, and without understanding a single word of it. The modern writers agree in denying that all the Zendavesta can have proceeded from one author. As the name Zoroaster (Zarathustra) is not a proper name, but a title of the religious heads of the Parsee religion, and as, according to the doctrine of the Parsees, every succeeding high priest inherited the spirit of prophecy, they assume that the Zendavesta is the joint production of the high priests of the old Persian empire. The founder of the religion, or the first Zarathustra, is distinguished from his successors in the Zendavesta itself by the family name *Spitama*.

We have already mentioned the Yazna as the most ancient component part of the Zendavesta. The name itself signifies prayer and sacrifice, and for the effective reading of a Yazna

by a priest, a number of sacred things, as sacred water, bread, etc., must be on hand. There are several Yaznas. The oldest Yazna, the most ancient part of the entire Zendavesta, is written in the sacred Gâtha dialect, and its chief contents are the five Gâtha or hymns.

The five hymns are the work of Zarathustra Spitama or his disciples. Later parts of the Zendavesta expressly designate him as the author of the Gâtha. He always speaks of himself in these hymns in the first person, while the later parts of the Zendavesta speak of him in the third person. The theology of the Gâtha is strict monotheism. Next to the first Yazna in rank and age is the "Yazna of Seven Chapters," composed by an early successor of Spitama, who is called Zarathustrôthemô, (Arch-Zarathustra, High Priest.) In it there is already to be found a deviation from the pure monotheism of Spitama, for other things besides Ahuramazda (Ormuzd) are invoked. Of still later origin is another Yazna, whose author, a later Zarathustra, seems to have endeavored to reconcile the adherents of the primitive polytheism by further concessions and by a return to the old customs and ceremonies. The intoxicating potation Soma (Homa in Zendavesta) was introduced, but somewhat differently prepared. Of equal rank with this part of the Zendavesta is the Visparad, a collection of prayers relating to the preparation of the sacred water and the consecration of offerings, such as the sacred bread and the Homa branches. All these offerings are only a remnant of the ancient Arian offerings, and are to represent a banquet which is prepared for the invoked heads or chieftains of the visible and invisible world.

The most modern part of the sacred Zend-writings are the Yasht, which originated after the genuine Zoroastrian monótheism had considerably degenerated. The authors of the Yasht elevated the ancient Arian deities, as Mithra, Tistrya, Anahita, to angels of the same rank with Ahuramazda, who is even sometimes called their worshiper. As one of these prayers mentions Gotama, the founder of Buddhism, and as it is reasonable to suppose that from the death of Gotama (543) at least one hundred years must have elapsed until Buddhism spread to Bactria, the origin of the Yasht may be fixed at the time between 350 and 450. That their origin falls into the fifth

century before Christ, Mr. Haug also infers from the circumstance that the worship of Mithra and Anahita, as we learn from two cuneiform inscriptions, was spreading in the Persian empire under Artaxerxes Mnemon, while Darius Hystaspes in his numerous inscriptions never makes mention of these deities. As to the other parts of the Zendavesta, the origin of the Gâtha and the teaching of Zarathustra Spitama may be fixed at 1200 B. C.; that of the older parts of the Vendidad about 1000 or 900; that of the younger Yazna at 800 or 700; that of the Pazend parts of the Vendidad about 500. As appears from these remarks, the Zendavesta contains the religious writings of a first founder who taught monotheism, while all the later parts testify to a relapse into a more ancient polytheism.

Haug has furnished new proofs that this polytheism of the Iranians, which was superseded by the monotheism of Zoroaster, was the same religion as that of the Indians. The split must have taken place at the time when most of the Vedic hymns originated, and Indra became the supreme god of the Brahmans. The Trinity, Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva, which in the post-Vedic time stands at the head of the gods, is mentioned neither in the Vedas nor in the Zendavesta. The hostility of Zarathustra Spitama to the sacrificial rites of the Brahmans is clearly expressed in several passages of the Gâtha. The causes which brought about a religious separation of the Arian peoples appear to have not been merely of a religious, but of a social character. The Brahmans, who remained nomads, fell out with those Arian tribes (the later Iranians) who settled as agriculturlists between the Oxus and Iaxartes, and this hostility led naturally to a religious as well as political estrangement, and to the establishment of the Ahura (Ormuzd) religion.

Germs of this faith must have been in existence before the appearance of Zarathustra Spitama, for the prophet, in his hymns, (Gâtha,) commends the wisdom of the Soshyants, or fire-priests, and teaches the worship of the Angra, or most ancient priest-families of the Arians, the same who are called in the Vedas, Angira. The Soshyants, or fire-priests, were the true predecessors of Zoroaster, for it is said of them in the Zendavesta that the good Ahura-faith had been revealed to them.

Perhaps the religious contest among the Arians had lasted for centuries before the split was consummated by Zarathustra Spitama, who in this sense alone can be regarded as the founder of the true Mazdayazna or Parsee religion.

All the Greek and Roman accounts of Zoroaster are mythical and untrustworthy. The later Vendidad endows him with supernatural, divine gifts, elevating him above the archangels, and ranking him next to God. From the ancient Yazna we only learn that Zarathustra belonged to the family Spitama, a branch of the Hetshataspa, and that the name of his only child, a daughter, was Pourutshista. His native country, it seems, was Bactria, which is mentioned in the Gâtha. According to Xanthus of Lydia, (470 B. C.,) the first Greek writer who mentions his name, he lived six hundred years before the outbreak of the Trojan war. Aristotle and Eudoxus place him six thousand years before Plato, others five thousand years before the Trojan war; and Berosus makes him the founder of a dynasty which ruled from 2200 to 2000 over Babylon. The Parsees themselves made their prophet a cotemporary of Hystaspes, the father of Darius, (550 B. C.;) but Haug has conclusively proved that this statement cannot be true, and that Zoroaster cannot have lived later than 1000 B. C.; while he is inclined to believe that he was a cotemporary of Moses.

The true doctrines of Zoroaster, as they were laid down in the ancient Yazna, especially in the Gâtha, were monotheistic. He knew only one God, while his predecessors, the Soshyants or fire-priests, invoked a number of good spirits, or Ahura. Zoroaster Spitama created the name Ahuramazdao, the Ahura who is called Mazdao, ("creator.") He was the source of all light and wisdom, the lord of all good things, spiritual and secular, the rewarder of the pious, the punisher of the wicked. A personal devil was not yet known to Spitama, but he assumed in Ormuzd the union of two spirits or powers, the "zpentô mainyus," the white or holy spirit, and the "angrô mainyus," or the black spirit. They were not two persons, but as it were two poles of the same personality. In the Gâtha, Ormuzd never contends against Ahriman, (angrô mainyus, the black spirit,) but against the original evil, which is called "druks," destruction, lie. Both activities of God are, although opposed to each other, yet necessary for the preservation of the world.

The white spirit appears in the luster of a friendly flame, the black one in coal and cinders; the white spirit produces the day, the black one the night; the former awakens life, which is extinguished by the black spirit, who, however, only bursts the earthly chains that the freed soul may soar up to everlasting life. But even this doctrine passed over into the belief in a divine dualism, two deities being created, Ormuzd and Ahriman, and thus the first step taken toward polytheism. It seems, however, that not all the Parsees apostatized from the true religion, for there was a sect of Magi which adhered to the old text and neglected dualism. At the time of the Sassanides an attempt was made by the Parsees to save monotheism by an erroneous interpretation of an ancient text. They assumed as a Supreme Being Zarvan Akarana, that is, the time without limit, and made Ahuramazda and Angromainyus spring from it. But the sense of the passage, as Haug shows, was, "Ahuramazda was created in the endless time;" that is, he was from eternity, instead of which the Destur wrongly translated, "he was born of the everlasting time."

Zarathustra Spitama teaches distinctly in the Gâtha a heaven, Garô-demâna, that is, the home of hymns, and a hell, Druyodemâna, the home of destruction. Between the two was the famous bridge Tchinvat Peretu, the bridge of the executioner or judge, over which only the souls of the just were able to pass, because the wicked ones were precipitated into hell. That the Magi believed in a resurrection of the dead is mentioned by as early a writer as Theopompus. In the Gâtha this doctrine is not expressly mentioned, but there can be no doubt that it was thought by Spitama, for the Gâtha contains an expression from which later the word Frasho-Kereti arose, which means perpetuation of life, and is the technical term for resurrection. Haug regards this doctrine as originally Zoroastrian, as not the least trace of a foreign origin can be recognized.

II.—The Modern Parsees.

On the present condition of the Parsee community no one, of course, can be expected to give so full and trustworthy information as an educated member of the sect. The two pamphlets by Dadabhai Naoroji, a learned Parsee and Professor of Gujerati at the University of London, which are men-

tioned at the head of our article, are therefore a most valuable addition to our knowledge of the Parsees.

According to this writer, the credit which the Parsees have often received for an uncommon amount of intelligence is not fully deserved. "The priests," he says, "as a body are not only ignorant of the duties and objects of their own profession, but are entirely uneducated, except that they are able to read and write, and that also often very imperfectly. They do not understand a single word of their prayers and recitations, which are all in the old Zend language."

The laity are therefore, as may be expected, profoundly ignorant of all that refers to religion. "The whole religious education of a Parsee child consists in preparing by rote a certain number of prayers in Zend, without understanding a word of them; the knowledge of the doctrines of their religion being left to be picked up from casual conversation." A Parsee in fact hardly knows what his faith is. The Zendavesta is to him a sealed book; and though there is a Gujerati translation of it, that translation is not made from the original, but from a Pehlevi paraphrase, nor is it recognized by the priests as an authorized version. Till about twenty-five years ago, there was no manual of the religious doctrines of the Parsees. Then a work of this kind was prepared, for the purpose, it seems, of counteracting the influence of the Christian missionaries. Dadabhai Naoroji gives extracts from this book, which shows that in accordance with the doctrine taught in the most ancient portions of the Zendavesta, the modern Parsees pay divine honor to Ormuzd alone, not to Ahriman. Their religious belief is reduced to two or three fundamental doctrines. They believe in one God, to whom they address their prayers. Their morality is comprised in these words: "Pure thoughts, pure words, pure deeds." Believing in the punishment of vice and the reward of virtue, they trust for pardon to the mercy of God.

Like so many other religious communities, Christian as well as non-Christian, the Parsees are divided into a conservative and progressive or liberal party. Dadabhai Naoroji himself belongs evidently to the liberal party, but he describes the distinctive customs of the conservatives without any polemical ardor, and apparently with great candor. Among the customs

of the old school, there is one which does not well agree with the purity they prize so highly in their system of ethics. It is the "Nirang," of which our Parsee author gives the following description: "The Nirang is the urine of cow, ox, or she goat, and the rubbing of it over the face and hands is the second thing a Parsee does after getting out of bed. Either before applying the Nirang to the face and hands, or while it remains on the hands after being applied, he should not touch anything directly with his hands; but in order to wash out the Nirang he either asks somebody else to pour water on his hands, or resorts to the device of taking hold of the pot through the intervention of a piece of cloth, such as a handkerchief or his sudra, that is, his blouse. He first pours water on one hand, then takes the pot in that hand and washes the other hand, face, and feet." Nor is this all. Women after child-birth have actually to drink a little of the Nirang, and the same rite is imposed on children at the time of their investiture with the Sudra and Kusti, the badges of Zoroastrian faith. The liberal school have completely abandoned this objectionable custom, but the old school still keep it up, though their faith, as Dadabhai Naoroji says, in the efficacy of Nirang may be shaken.

The principal points for which the liberals among the Parsees are, at the present moment, contending, are the abolition of the filthy purifications by means of Nirang; the reduction of a large number of obligatory prayers; the prohibition of early betrothal and marriage; the suppression of extravagance at weddings and funerals; the education of women, and their admission into general society. A society has been formed, called the "Rahanumace Mazdiashna," that is, the guide of the worshipers of God. Meetings are held, speeches are made, tracts distributed. A counter-society, too, has been started, called "The True Guides," but as Dadabhai Naoroji tells us, the bigotry of the conservatives and the weakness of their arguments have considerably improved the prospects of the reformers.

III.—Prospects of Parseeism.

We have already had occasion to state that the increase in the number of the Parsees and their advance in prosperity

and influence dates from the arrival of the Europeans in India.* The Parsees themselves are well aware of the advantages which from the European rule have accrued to them. They are, as a class, devoted partisans of England, and therefore honored and patronized, in turn, by the English. They have followed the English to Cabul, have settled in many seaports of China, and more recently have even established mercantile firms at London and Liverpool. They are represented in all branches of life, and in particular are they fond of becoming bankers or brokers. No Parsee who can in any way make it possible neglects to give to his children a European education. All the public and private schools of Bombay, with the exception of those of the missionaries, are filled with Parsee children. Even the education of girls, which by all the non-Christian denominations in the East is utterly neglected, is attracting the attention of the Parsees. In 1862 and 1863 several distinguished Parsees, under the guidance of Dr. Bhau Dajee, traveled throughout India, in order to collect information on the literary institutions of the country. They traveled from Bombay to Madras, from there to Calcutta, the north-western provinces, the Punjab and Affghanistan, returning by way of Mooltan and the Indus to their native presidency, Bombay. On February 10, 1863, they visited the Free Church (of Scotland) Institution in Calcutta, along with the Rev. Dr. Duff. They took notes of all they saw, and expressed themselves highly gratified. Dr. Duff's girls' school they pronounced the most gratifying sight they had seen in Calcutta. A remarkable speech was made by one of them in Mhow, where they were entertained by their brethren. He proposed the health

* On their transmigration to India, the Parsees have an account entitled Kissa-i-Sanyan, (that is, the narration of Sanyan,) and compiled in 1599. In order to escape the intolerance of the Mohammedan conquerors, a small number of the adherents of the ancient Persian religion fled to the neighboring island of Ormus; but later they left this place of refuge and migrated in 717 to the town of Sanyan, (near Daman,) upon the continent of India, where a Hindu king gave them toleration and dwellings. Here the Parsees lived for centuries, as it seems, unmolested, until the Mohammedans penetrated also into India, and the Parsees had to share the fate of the Hindus. They left Sanyan and turned to Nausan in Gujerat, where up to the present day many Parsees are living. Though despised and oppressed by the Moslems, they spread into the neighboring towns. Their wealthy and influential position in society originated with the establishment of the European rule.

of "the Cama family." "The Cama family," he said, "have practiced what they preach. Their exertions in the cause of education show this." The speaker went on to say: "Will any one here say that the social position of our wives is not disgraceful? How do we treat them? As slaves: worse than slaves. Do they share in our enjoyments? Here we are, at this very moment, with a repast before us which the most epicurean European might well envy, and have we a single lady present to share in our festivity? Can we call ourselves civilized beings, when we can regale ourselves in this way without thinking for a moment of our wives and daughters? I am afraid, gentlemen, that the position we have obtained in European eyes of our civilization is not deserved, and never will be deserved until we follow in a body and with a clear heart the Cama family, who have been the foremost to break the great barrier which superstition, narrow-mindedness, and selfishness have raised against the liberty of our partners." An establishment which, in honor of the most celebrated member of the sect, is called Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy Translation Fund, has an annual income of 40,000 rupees for the purpose of translating good European works into the Gujerati language, and of circulating them at a low price or gratuitously among the Parsees. In the schools connected with the Parsee Benevolent Institution, established in 1849 by Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, there were, in 1863, one thousand and seventy-two boys and six hundred and sixteen girls in daily attendance. At an examination of these schools in 1863, Sir Bartle Frere, who presided, remarked that he remembered visiting these schools some ten years since with their founder, his revered friend, the late Sir Jamsetjee, and was happy to find how much they had prospered since that time.

The liberality of the rich Parsees is by no means confined to their own community. The Bombay University has been repeatedly benefited by it. Thus we learn from the *Friend of India* (March 18, 1863) that Limjee Manockjee and Cowasjee Manockjee, Esqs., offered to the Vice-Chancellor of the University the sum of five thousand rupees for the purpose of founding an annual gold medal, to bear the name of their father, the late Manockjee Limjee, Esq., and to be awarded every year for the best essay by a university student on some

subject of Indian history, or antiquities, or on some question connected with the introduction of European science into the country. More recently the present Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy offered the sum of twenty-five thousand rupees for the erection of a public fountain in Bombay, on the site of the Wellesley statue. Similar facts we find frequently referred to in the journals of East India.

The prosperity which the Parsee community of India has attained, and their great intellectual superiority over the Hindu world in the midst of which they have lived so many centuries, have made the Parsees clannish and proud. They will not permit one of their number to become a beggar or a pauper. This pride has also been one of the reasons which have prevented the progress of Christianity among them. We have seen it stated that no Parsee has yet been converted to Christianity. This is probably an exaggeration, but it is certain that they have hitherto opposed to the missionaries a very determined resistance. The prominence which the faith in the unity of Deity holds in their system has made them, like the Mohammedans, scorn any intimation of a trinity of persons in that unity. More recently they have shown, however, a great appreciation of the missionary schools; and their readiness to offer the presidency of their Theological Seminary to Dr. Haug seems to indicate that they do not mean to continue in an everlasting opposition to Christianity.

In Persia* both the aspects and prospects of the Parsees are less brilliant than in India. The fanaticism of the Mussulmans, which drove the majority of their ancestors to India, has not yet ceased to persecute them. It is especially on the death of the Shah of Persia that they become a victim of the popular fury. They are ill-treated, robbed of their property, and frequently killed. Their sacred books are frequently taken from them and burned, probably in order to efface in them every remembrance of their ancestors. The constant dread of persecution has made them timid and submissive, and they make the utmost efforts to conciliate their Mohammedan neighbors by politeness. They are very poor. Dr. Peterman met in Persia with a rich Parsee† of India, who told him that he

* They live in particular in Jezd, a city of nearly 100,000 inhabitants; in Taft and the neighboring region, in Kirman, in Teheran, in Ispahan.

† Petermann, Reisen im Orient, vol. ii, p. 179.

was sent as a delegate to the Shah of Persia in order to ask of him permission for the Indian Parsees to pay all the taxes of their Persian brethren. Their prospects in Persia would greatly improve if religious toleration were fully established.

Art. VIII.—SIR THOMAS BROWNE.

"*Religio Medici;*" "A Letter to a Friend;" "Christian Morals;" "Urn Burial," and other Papers. By Sir Thomas Browne, Kt., M.D. 12mo., pp. 440. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1862.

Sir Thomas Browne's Works, including his Life and Correspondence. Edited by Simon Wilkin, Esq. Four volumes. 8vo. London: 1836.

The reader who takes up for the first time some work of genius is conscious of a peculiar pleasure. He finds his previous anticipations realized, and a new world of delightful meditation opened before him. This is the experience in reading Sir Thomas Browne. His *Religio Medici*, Christian Morals, and Urn Burial, have all the simplicity, strength, and moral elevation which characterize the great works of mind.

Sir Thomas Browne was born in London, October 19, 1605, and died on his birthday at Norwich in 1682, aged 77. His father came of an ancient family in Cheshire, and enjoyed a good name as an honest merchant. His father used to uncover his breast when he was asleep, and kiss it in prayers over him, as is said of Origen's father, that the Holy Ghost would take possession there. But this most excellent parent died while his son was yet a child. Notwithstanding a dishonest guardian, who defrauded him of part of his patrimony, he found his way to school at Winchester, where he acquitted himself with honor, and finally, in 1627, graduated from Pembroke College, Oxford. Under the direction of his step-father, he traveled extensively through Ireland, France, and Italy; and finally, returning through Holland, took his doctor's degree at Leyden. On coming back to London, at thirty years of age, he wrote his *Religio Medici*, one of the most remarkable productions in the language.

"For a character of his person," says the Rev. John Whitefoot, who lived for many years the constant friend and neighbor of Sir Thomas, "his complexion and hair were answerable to his name; his stature was moderate, and habit of body neither fat nor lean, but εὔσαρκος. In his habit of clothing he had an aversion to all finery, and affected plainness both in the fashion and ornaments."

"He was never seen to be transported with mirth or dejected with sadness; always cheerful, but rarely merry at any sensible rate; seldom heard to break a jest; and when he did, he would be apt to blush at the levity of it. His gravity was natural without affectation." "His modesty was visible in a natural habitual blush, which was increased upon the least occasion, and oft discovered without any observable cause."

Sir Thomas was learned, accomplished, and prepossessing; and yet, it would seem by a passage in his writings, was singularly indifferent to marriage, expressing his belief that it were just as well that men should propagate as trees, if that had only been divinely appointed. The most noticeable fact of all is, that these views did not prevent him from marrying a most charming woman, with whom he lived very happily, raising an affectionate and talented family. He no doubt felt himself sufficiently secure in his domestic enjoyments from the polished shafts of the Encyclopedists and reviewers, who have not failed to ridicule this eccentricity.

Edward, son of Sir Thomas Browne, was sent in 1657, at fifteen years of age, to Cambridge, and in 1665 took his degree of Bachelor of Medicine. He traveled over Bohemia, Hungary, and Friuli, and returning, settled in London, and published in 1673 the observations of his travels. He became distinguished for his superior learning, was made Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, and of the Royal Society, Physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and first physician to king Charles II. King Charles said, "he was as learned as any of the college, and as well-bred as any at court." He continued to hold the office of President of the College of Physicians until 1708, the time of his death.

Thomas, another son, a brave and noble youth, distinguished himself in the Royal Navy. The following language, which belongs to him, shows of what stuff he was made. He says,

"it is impossible to express unto another how a smart sea-fight elevates the spirits of a man and makes him despise all dangers." The time of his death seems only to have been conjectural. How often a cloud of mystery rests upon the last hours of the brave!

We will trace but one more link in the domestic life of this great and good man. Of his favorite daughter Sir Thomas says: "Thou didst use to pass away much of thy time alone and by thyself in sober ways and good actions, so that *noe* place how solitary *soe*'ever can be strange to thee, nor indeed solitary, since God whom thou servest is everywhere with thee."

But the distinguished merit of Sir Thomas Browne did not exempt him from the assaults of criticism. Such men as Johnson, Hallam, Hazlitt, and Coleridge have passed judgment on his writings, and it is necessary to consider that judgment in order to estimate his genius.

Dr. Johnson does not appear to appreciate the poetical figures of Browne. Of his style the author of Rasselas says: "It strikes, but does not please. His tropes are harsh, and his combinations uncouth." But Dr. Johnson admits that he has great excellences, and observes, "it is not on the praises of others but on his own writings that Sir Thomas Browne is to depend for the esteem of posterity; of which he will not easily be deprived while learning shall have any reverence among men; for there is no science in which he does not discover some skill, and scarce any kind of knowledge, profane or sacred, which he does not appear to have cultivated with success."

Hallam, in his "Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries," judges Sir Thomas Browne with too great severity. After admitting that the favorable estimate of Dr. Johnson is in the main correct, and that the mind of Browne was "fertile and ingenious," and "his analogies original and sometimes brilliant," he observes: "He was, however, far removed from real philosophy; both by his turn of mind, and the nature of his erudition, he seldom reasons; his thoughts are desultory; sometimes he appears skeptical or paradoxical; but credulity and deference to authority prevail." Again he says: "His egotism is equal to that of Montaigne, but with this difference, that it is the egotism

of a melancholy mind, which generally becomes unpleasing." "A man of so much credulity and such an irregular imagination as Browne was almost sure to believe in witchcraft, and all sorts of spiritual agencies. In no respect did he go in advance of his age, unless we make an exception for his declaration against persecution."

We need not follow further the surly criticisms of Hallam. As for the charge of egotism, let it be answered in Browne's own language in the *Religio Medici:* "I intend no monopoly but a community in learning; I study not for my own sake only, but for theirs that study not for themselves. I envy no man that knows more than myself, but pity them that know less."

The truth is, Hallam entirely misinterprets Browne. He accuses him of being fond of the trifling questions which the bad taste of the schoolmen had introduced. Sir Thomas brings forward the conceits of the schoolmen only to confute them, or moralizes over them as Hamlet over the skulls which the grave-digger threw up at his feet.

The *Religio Medici* was first written for the private reading of a few friends, was transcribed, and after the seventh or eighth year, published. Some found the author an atheist; others a Catholic; Sir Kenelm Digby reviewed the work; Alexander Ross sought to crush it with a hostile reply; Buddæus reviled all physicians in wrath at the impiety of the English doctor; while with greater justice Conringius fervently wished every theologian were as pious. Four years later appeared the "Enquiries into Vulgar Errors;" and finally, Browne was knighted at Oxford by Charles II.

The idea that first a surreptitious edition of the *Religio Medici* "was conveyed to the press by a distant hand, so that the circulation of a false copy might be an excuse for publishing the true," is contradicted by the explicit statement of Sir Thomas himself. But setting aside this, a trick of deception is so contrary to the whole-souled honor everywhere beaming from the writings of the author, and is so contrary to the character ascribed to him by his cotemporaries, that such a conclusion cannot for a moment be seriously entertained.

Another charge against our author is the impiety of his works. On this point the testimony of the Encyclopedia

Britannica may be safely taken as expressing the enlightened judgment of the wisest and best of the Christian world. Of Browne's greatest production it observes: "This singular work has been censured by some as inclining to infidelity, and even to atheism; while others with better judgment have applauded its religious tendency, as well as the ability and learning of the author."

The testimony of Coleridge with reference to the same work, the *Religio Medici*, is peculiar and interesting. He says: "This book paints certain parts of my moral and intellectual being (the best parts no doubt) better than any other book I have ever met with; and the style is throughout delicious."

Sir Thomas Browne put on record, for the government of his private conduct, such resolves as these:

> To be sure that no day pass without calling upon God in a solemn formed prayer, seven times within the compass thereof. To take occasion of praying upon the sight of any church which I see or pass by as I ride about. After a sermon to make a thanksgiving, and desire a blessing, and to pray for the minister. To pray in all places where privacy inviteth in any house, highway, or street; and to know no street or passage in this city (London) which may not witness that I have not forgot God and my Saviour in it; and that no parish or town where I have been may not say the like. In tempestuous weather, lightning and thunder, either night or day, to pray for God's merciful protection upon all men, and his mercy upon their souls, bodies, and goods.

If this be impiety, it is of a most singular kind, and we may well pray God that there may be more of it at the present day.

To say that Sir Thomas Browne believed in witchcraft is only to attribute to him the common belief of the age in which he lived, and to place him in the same category with Lord Bacon. We ought not to berate him too soundly until our own age has emerged more fully from the mysteries of the so-called *spiritual manifestations.*

A very just and appreciative view of the writings of Sir Thomas Browne may be found in the Edinburgh Review, No. 129, Oct., 1836. The writer of the paper alluded to very properly claims that a great mistake is made in estimating Sir Thomas Browne, when we separate him from the age in which he lived; an age that commenced with Bacon, and closed with Locke in 1705. He proceeds to say:

In the earlier stages of the literature of a nation the demarkations between prose and poetry are comparatively faint and confused. The prodigal superstitions, the credulous errors from which men emerge into the dawn of truth, still linger around the footsteps of the hardiest adventurers. They enter the domains of reason guided by the imagination, and carry not only the language but the temperament of poetry into the severest province of prose. Whoever looks into our own literature will find a strong illustration of this general truth. When, fresh from the giant impulse of the Reformation, the intellect of England broke forth under Elizabeth, a variety of causes combined to quicken and exalt the imagination. The defiance of Rome, the discovery of America, the effects of the press, the almost simultaneous burst of the Greek, the Roman, the Italian poetry upon the wonder and emulation of men born precisely at an age when thought was most broadly and deeply agitated by political circumstances, were not events that tended to divide the poet from the philosopher. On the contrary, no channel of research, however guarded and fenced about, could resist the rush of the great deep so universally broken up. Poetry flowed into every course, and sparkled upon every wave in which men could launch what Bacon has so nobly called "the ships of time." Whoever turns from Chaucer and his earlier successors to the literature of Elizabeth and James, will see how completely the revolution produced in great measure by translations, had changed the genius of the language from the simple to the splendid. The wonderful translation of the Bible familiarized the ear to, and colored the language with the expressions of the East. The Reformation was our Pisistratus; the translation of the Bible was our Homer. A new inspiration and a new audience were produced, for the most popular book in England was the most glorious poetry in the world.

Such were the influences that surrounded Sir Thomas Browne, who, we may say with Jeremy Taylor, "continued to the last to live apart and aloof among his ancient authors, and his quaint but sublime thoughts; a scholar by habit, a philosopher by boast, and a poet by nature."

In his "Garden of Cyrus" Browne did not adopt the quincunx purely as a brilliant whim, nor yet as a wholly serious and important discovery in philosophy. "The thought charmed his imagination; it afforded scope for his curious and scattered learning, for his golden and fantastic thoughts." As a chemist and naturalist he is more cautious and uses plain common sense. He is not in reality an egotist, but only takes himself as in some sense a type of humanity.

Perhaps among no class of men is Sir Thomas Browne more

popular than among clergymen. His quaint expressions, striking paradoxes, and devotional fervor, as well as his lively fancy and his elevated views of divine truth, have given him a wide influence. Even Hallam admits that he was in advance of his age in Christian toleration. Though he did not wield the flaming sword of Milton, which was foremost in the conflicts for the rights of the people, and brilliant in every realm of mind, yet he wrought good work, and in these glowing words declared his sympathy for humanity: "They may sit in the orchestra and noblest seats of heaven, who have held up shaking hands in the fire and humanly contended for glory."

We will now proceed to lay before the reader some more complete specimens of the writer's style and thought, being well assured that the greatest praise we can give him is to let him speak for himself. Take the opening paragraph of the *Religio Medici.*

> For my religion, though there be several circumstances that might persuade the world I have none at all, as the general scandal of my profession, the natural course of my studies, the indifferency of my behavior and discourse in matters of religion, neither violently defending one nor with that common ardor and contention opposing another; yet in despite hereof I dare, without usurpation, assume the honorable style of a Christian. Not that I merely owe this title to the font, my education, or clime wherein I was born, as being bred up either to confirm those principles my parents instilled into my unwary understanding, or by a general consent to proceed in the religion of my country; but having in my riper years and confirmed judgment seen and examined all, I find myself obliged by the principles of grace, and the law of mine own reason, to embrace no other name but this: neither doth herein my zeal so far make me forget the general charity I owe unto humanity as rather to hate than pity Turks, infidels, and (what is worse) Jews; rather contenting myself to enjoy that happy style than maligning those who refuse so glorious a title.

> Quousque patiere, bone Jesu!
> Judæi te semel, ego sæpius crucifixi:
> Illi in Asia, ego in Britannia,
> Gallia, Germania;
> Bone Jesu, miserere mei, et Judæorum.—Pp. 7, 8.

A translation can hardly give the beauty of the original of this poetic fragment.

How long shalt thou suffer, O blessed Jesus!
The Jews crucified thee once, I often;
They in Asia, I in Britain,
Gaul, Germany:
Good Jesus, have pity on me and on the Jews.

But our author further avows his religious predilections:

But to difference myself nearer, and draw into a lesser circle: there is no Church, whose every part so squares unto my conscience, whose articles, constitutions, and customs seem so consonant unto reason, and as it were framed to my particular devotion, as this whereof I hold my belief, the Church of England, to whose faith I am a sworn subject; and therefore in a double obligation subscribe unto her articles, and endeavor to observe her constitutions; whatsoever is beyond, as points indifferent, I observe according to the rules of my private reason, or the humor and fashion of my devotion, neither believing this because Luther affirmed it, nor disapproving that, because Calvin hath disavouched it. I condemn not all things in the Council of Trent, nor approve all in the Synod of Dort. In brief, where the Scripture is silent, the Church is my text; where that speaks, 'tis but my comment; where there is a joint silence of both, I borrow not the rules of my religion from Rome or Geneva, but the dictates of my own reason. It is an unjust scandal of our adversaries, and a gross error in ourselves, to compute the nativity of our religion from Henry the Eighth, who, though he rejected the Pope, refused not the faith of Rome, and effected no more than what his own predecessors desired and assayed in ages past, and was conceived the state of Venice would have attempted in our days.—P. 12.

We can well perceive from this quotation with how little justice Hallam has accused Sir Thomas Browne of wavering between the Church and the Dissenters. There is much sound sense in the following, on divine mysteries:

As for those wingy mysteries in divinity, and airy subtleties in religion, which have unhinged the brains of better heads, they never stretched the *pia mater* of mine: methinks there be not impossibilities enough in religion for an active faith; the deepest mysteries ours contains, have not only been illustrated, but maintained by syllogism, and the rule of reason. I love to lose myself in a mystery, to pursue my reason to an *O altitudo!* 'Tis my solitary recreation to pose my apprehension with those involved enigmas and riddles of the trinity, with incarnation and resurrection. I can answer all the objections of Satan and my rebellious reason with that odd resolution I learned of Tertullian, *Certum est quia impossibile est.* I desire to exercise my faith in the difficultest point; for to credit ordinary and visible objects, is not

faith but persuasion. Some believe the better for seeing Christ's sepulcher; and when they have seen the Red Sea, doubt not of the miracle. Now contrarily I bless myself, and am thankful that I live not in the days of miracles; that I never saw Christ nor his disciples; I would not have been one of those Israelites that passed the Red Sea, nor one of Christ's patients on whom he wrought his wonders; then had my faith been thrust upon me; nor should I enjoy that greater blessing pronounced to all that believe and saw not. 'Tis an easy and necessary belief to credit what our eye and sense hath examined: I believe he was dead and buried, and rose again, and desire to see him in his glory, rather than to contemplate him in his cenotaph or sepulcher. Nor is this much to believe; as we have reason, we owe this faith unto history: they only had the advantage of a bold and noble faith, who lived before his coming, who upon obscure prophecies and mystical types could raise a belief and expect apparent impossibilities.—P. 20.

We will now turn for a moment to the *proverbia*, or brilliant gems of wit and fancy that are to be found scattered through the pages of our author. Take the following as specimens of what the reader may meet without any laborious search. He says:

In expectation of a better I can with patience embrace this life, yet in my best meditations do often defy death: I honor any man that contemns it, nor can I highly love any that is afraid of it. This makes me naturally love a soldier, and honor those tattered and contemptible regiments that will die at the command of a sergeant. For a pagan there may be some motives to be in love with life; but for a Christian to be amazed at death, I see not how he can escape this dilemma, that he is too sensible of this life, or hopeless of the life to come.

There is a nearer way to heaven than Homer's chain, (Iliad, viii, 18,) an easy logic may conjoin heaven and earth in one argument, and with less than a *sorites* resolve all things into God. For though we christen effects by their most sensible—and nearest—causes, yet is God the true and infallible cause of all.

The bad construction and perverse comment on these second causes or visible hands of God have perverted the devotion of many unto atheism.—Pp. 77, 41.

I am much taken with two verses of Lucan, since I have been able not only as we do at school, to construe, but understand.

> Victurosque Dei celant ut vivere durent
> Felix esse mori.—*Pharsalia*, iv, 519.
>
> We're all deluded, vainly searching ways
> To make us happy by the length of days;
> For cunningly to make 's protract this breath,
> The gods conceal the happiness of death.

It is a brave act of valor to contemn death; but where life is more terrible than death, it is then the truest valor to dare to live; and herein religion hath taught us a noble example; for all the valiant acts of Curtius, Scævola, or Codrus do not parallel or match that one of Job; and sure there is no torture to the rack of a disease, nor any poniards in death itself like those in the way or prologue unto it. *Emori nolo, sed me esse mortuum nihil æstumo,** I would not die, but care not to be dead.—P. 85.

Men that look no further than their outsides think health an appurtenance unto life, and quarrel with their constitutions for being sick; but I, that have examined the parts of man and know upon what tender filaments that fabric hangs, do wonder that we are not always so; and considering the thousand doors that lead to death do thank my God that we can die but once. . . . I believe the world grows near its end, yet is neither old nor decayed, nor will ever perish upon the ruins of its own principles.—Pp. 86, 88.

Our author thus forcibly expresses himself on our inability to define heaven or hell:

Now the necessary mansions of our restored selves are those two contrary and incompatible places we call heaven and hell. To define them, or strictly to determine what and where these are, surpasseth my divinity. That elegant apostle, which seemed to have a glimpse of heaven, hath left but a negative description thereof: *which neither eye hath seen, nor ear hath heard, nor can enter into the heart of man:* he was translated out of himself to behold it; but being returned into himself could not express it.—P. 95.

Thus does he speak of the saved and lost:

I believe many are saved who to man seem reprobated; and many are reprobated who, in the opinion and sentence of man, stand elected. There will appear at the last day strange and unexpected examples both of his justice and his mercy, and therefore to define either is folly in man, and insolency even in the devils: those acute and subtle spirits in all their sagacity can hardly divine who shall be saved; which, if they could prognostic, their labor were at an end; nor need they compass the earth seeking whom they may devour.—P. 109.

"Before Abraham was, I am," is the saying of Christ; yet is it true in some sense, if I say it of myself; for I was not only before myself, but Adam, that is, in the idea of God, and the decree of that synod held from all eternity; and in this sense, I say, the world was before the creation, and at an end before it had a beginning; and thus was I dead before I was alive; though my grave be England, my dying place was Paradise; and Eve miscarried of me before she conceived of Cain.—P. 111.

* Cic. Tusc. Disp., i, 8.

Speaking of *harmony*, our author says: "It unties the ligaments of my frame, takes me to pieces, dilates me out of myself, and by degrees, methinks, resolves me into heaven."—P. 139. "For my conversation, it is like the sun's, with all men, and with a friendly aspect to good and bad." Let us take leave of the *Religio Medici* with a quotation from the second part, on Sleep. It leads the reader on naturally to the conclusion, which soon follows:

We term sleep, a death; and yet it is waking that kills us and destroys those spirits that are the house of life. 'Tis indeed a part of life that best expresseth death; for every man truly lives, so long as he acts his nature, or some way makes good the faculties of himself. Themistocles, therefore, that slew his soldier in his sleep, was a merciful executioner: 'tis a kind of punishment the mildness of no laws hath invented. I wonder the fancy of Lucan and Seneca did not discover it. It is that death by which we may be literally said to die daily; a death which Adam died before his mortality; a death whereby we live a middle and moderating point between life and death; in fine, so like death, I dare not trust it without my prayers, and an half adieu unto the world, and take my farewell in a colloquy with God:

The night is come; like to the day,
Depart not thou, great God, away.
Let not my sins, black as the night,
Eclipse the luster of thy light.
Keep still in my horizon; for to me
The sun makes not the day, but Thee,
Thou whose nature cannot sleep,
On my temples sentry keep;
Guard me 'gainst those watchful foes,
Whose eyes are open while mine close.
Let no dreams my head infest,
But such as Jacob's temples blest.
Whilst I do rest, my soul advance;
Make my sleep a holy trance,
That I may, my rest being wrought,
Awake into some holy thought,
And with as active vigor run
My course, as doth the nimble sun.
Sleep is a death. O make me try,
By sleeping, what it is to die!
And as gently lay my head
On my grave, as now my bed.
How'er I rest, great God, let me
Awake again at last with Thee.
And thus assured, behold I lie
Securely, or to wake or die.
These are my drowsy days; in vain
I do now wake to sleep again;
O come that hour when I shall never
Sleep thus again, but wake forever!

This is the dormitive I take to bed-ward; I need no other laudanum than this to make me sleep; after which I close mine eyes in security, content to take my leave of the sun and sleep unto the resurrection.—P. 149.

We pass over the "Christian Morals," "Vulgar Errors," and other treatises of our author, simply observing that they are filled with the inspiration of the same genius that we have already observed. The "Hydriotaphia," or "Urn Burial," however, deserves a more special notice. It is a sublime prose poem on death and immortality. Its noble sentiments and beautiful expression are enough to insure the fame of any author. We select a few short quotations:

Happy are they which live not in that disadvantage of time when men could say little for futurity but from reason, whereby the noblest minds fell often upon doubtful deaths and melancholy dissolutions. . . . Our fathers find their graves in our short memories, and sadly tell us how we may be buried in our survivors. Gravestones tell truth scarce forty years. Generations pass while some trees stand, and old families last not three oaks. To be read by bare inscriptions, like many in Gruter,* to hope for eternity by enigmatical epithets or first letters of our names; to be studied by antiquaries, who we were, and have new names given us like many of the mummies, are cold consolations unto the students of perpetuity, even by everlasting languages. . . . Yet to be nameless in worthy deeds exceeds an infamous history. The Canaanitish woman lives more happily without a name than Herodias with one. And who had not rather have been the good thief than Pilate?—P. 337, etc.

Thersites is like to live as long as Agamemnon. Who knows whether the best of men be known, or whether there be not more remarkable persons forgot than any that stand remembered in the known account of time? Without the favor of the everlasting register the first man had been as unknown as the last, and Methuselah's long life had been his only chronicle. . . . Oblivion is not to be hired. The greater part must be content to be as though they had not been, to be found in the register of God, not in the record of man. Twenty-seven names make up the first story, and the recorded names ever since contain not one living century. The number of the dead long exceedeth all that shall live. The night of time far surpasseth the day; and who knows when was the equinox?

In the same spirit is the following from "The Fragment on Mummies:"

* Gruteri Inscriptiones Antiquæ.

Time sadly overcometh all things, and is now dominant, and sitteth upon a sphynx, and looketh unto Memphis and old Thebes; while his sister Oblivion reclineth semi-somnous on a pyramid, gloriously triumphing, making puzzles of Titanian erections, and turning old glories into dreams. History sinketh beneath her cloud. The traveler as he paceth amazedly through those deserts, asketh of her who builded them? and she mumbleth something, but what it is he heareth not.

Let us throw a gleam of light athwart this darkness: "We live by an invisible sun within us." "There is nothing strictly immortal but immortality." By immortality he means God, who endows his creatures with his own perpetuity.

It becomes an interesting question under what influences was the genius of Sir Thomas Browne evolved. We have already briefly adverted to this point. It was a period of revolutions, which witnessed the beheading of Charles the First, and the protectorate by Cromwell, the campaigns of Gustavus Adolphus, the voyage of the Puritans, the discovery of Hudson's Bay, the founding of Boston and Quebec, and the settlement of Jamestown. Gilbert was discovering the power of electricity, Galileo was inventing the telescope, Kepler was propounding his theory of the heavens, Bacon was philosophizing, Sir William Herschel was bidding farewell to earth, and Harvey was discoursing on the circulation of the blood. Such was the era, an age of revolutions, of great deeds and fiery thought. Our author says of himself:

As yet I have not seen one revolution of Saturn, nor hath my pulse beat thirty years; and yet, excepting one, I have seen the ashes of and left underground all the kings of Europe, have been cotemporary to three Emperors, four Grand Signiors, and as many Popes.—P. 81.

Great minds emerge from social and civil convulsions as comets and asteroids spring from disrupted worlds. And *this* age will evoke its great minds to guide the storm when the pen and the sword have with one stroke erased the stain from a great nation's ensign and freed millions in a day.

The writings of Sir Thomas Browne are a profitable study for an age like ours. We see the folly of human passions. We behold the works of human grandeur and glory melting away into eternity, and all pride humbled in view of "that

duration which maketh pyramids pillars of snow, and all that's past a moment." Whether in the opening paragraph of the *Religio Medici* we are moved by the pathos of the author when he assumes "the honorable style of a Christian," and laments over himself and the Jews, or we pause among urns and mummies to learn the vanity of earth and interrogate heaven, we are led by the wand of an enchanter over whom death has no power.

The extracts we have given are but a taste of the banquet that awaits the reader. Ticknor & Fields have given us a book well adapted to general circulation, and yet a good substitute for the London edition, which may be consulted by the curious scholar. Our American publishers have, in the cream-tinted paper, clear type, and perfect accuracy of this volume, conferred a great favor on the reading public. All will be profited by consulting these beautiful pages. Let them study the example and writings of Sir Thomas Browne. Those who tread the dusty thoroughfares of life here see the practicability and pleasure of occasional excursions into the green fields of poetic thought and fancy; those who pant after immortality are encouraged to aspire to heaven; and those who seek the rewards of an honorable ambition are taught to build up the structures of immortal mind, the only monuments that defy the march of time.

Art. IX.—THE WAR FOR THE UNION.

Our civil war, now become the settled business of the nation, at first took the world greatly by surprise. Our quadrennial elections for President had always been followed by such ready and perfect acquiescence, that men generally were astounded when close on the heels of that of 1860 followed a gigantic insurrection. And yet, to the thoughtful observer of national affairs, there had long been causes at work in our body politic of which such an insurrection was but the natural outgrowth and development. These causes date back to the period prior

to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, but more immediately and especially to that embraced by the administration of Washington. For it was during his administration that the Constitution—becoming then the law of the land—received its first practical exposition and enforcement. The government which it brought into being was at first merely a paper one. Of itself—*per se*—it had no force or effect. But it was to take form and force from the manner in which it was expounded and administered.

There can be little doubt that the founders of the present American Government intended it to be a strong one. They were weary of the vexations and the perplexities that beset them at almost every step, in the form of State Rights, under the old Articles of Confederation, and when they set up the Federal Government, they meant to endow it with the authority and the power of the whole American people. Therefore it was they declared that "WE THE PEOPLE," not "we the states," do ordain and establish it "for ourselves and our posterity." But the machinery of the government had scarcely been set in motion before the germs of two parties unfortunately appeared. The one, headed by Alexander Hamilton, held that the new government was really a *government*, established by the whole people, for the people, and endowed with all the functions and powers necessary for sovereignty and rule. The other, led by that matchless leader Thomas Jefferson, claimed that the several states were still sovereign in a great degree, and that the federal government, having been derived from the states, was powerless as against the states, except within certain limits expressly defined in the constitution itself. In a word, the one pleaded for a strong government; strong at home, as well as abroad, prepared for all emergencies; while the other argued that the central government would be dangerous to local liberties, unless surrounded by manifold checks and balances. Hamilton was undoubtedly a statesman of great parts, was certainly unsurpassed by any statesman of his day, but as a party politician he was no match for the bold, resolute, scheming, and worldly-wise Virginian. While the one contended ably for a strong republic, the other was already popularizing doctrines that tended to a wild democracy. Adopting as his war-cry the popular maxim of that age, "the world is governed too much,"

Mr. Jefferson evidently forgot that there might come a time when the chief trouble of his country would be—being governed too little. His advocacy of the decentralization of the government, and the localization of power, was necessarily popular, because such a government would give importance to localities and individuals that would otherwise remain obscure and unknown. His platform, therefore, soon enlisted the sympathies and the active energies of all such, and though frowned upon by Washington, Madison, and other great worthies of that day, its ascendancy was only a question of time. The result was, that Hamilton soon came to be denounced as an aristocrat and monarchist, while Jefferson was hailed as the philosopher and democrat, the model statesman, the people's friend. Whatever else may be said of Mr. Jefferson, the logic of his doctrine of decentralization was soon unmistakable, as in time counties came to question the authority of states, and townships that of counties, until at length it happened all authority was deemed irksome, and all constraint called despotism.

This pestilent heresy of "State Rights,"

Sole source of all our woes,

thus fostered and insisted upon, soon begat that jealousy of the national government, early christened the "Spirit of Disunion," whose natural fruit was the Hartford Convention, and whose logical development, Nullification. Both of these insurrectionary movements ignominiously failed, not so much because of any force which the national government brought to bear against them, as because of the want of a common bond of union to link together disaffected communities. John C. Calhoun, who, disappointed in his hopes of the American Presidency, next turned Nullifier to establish a separate empire, was slow to perceive this *fatal* defect in his schemes. But no sooner was this wily conspirator brought to realize it, than he stopped the insurgent movement and bade his associates "bide their time." It is a great mistake to suppose that the spirit of disunion expired in 1832 with the fires of nullification, that then, unhappily mostly of their own accord, went quietly out. The high crime committed against the nation was not punished. The wicked criminals, all of them, went unwhipt of justice,

and the foul conspiracy itself was not even broken up; it was only adjourned *sine die*, to meet again at the call of its accomplished chieftain. Andrew Jackson, that man of strong sense as well as strong passions, (for it is Plutarch who observes that "great parts are often attended by great vices, as well as great virtues,") early divined this. Knowing, necessarily, more of Calhoun's plans than any other man of that day, he felt, in his inmost soul, that he had only scotched the snake, not killed it. To the day of his death, it was his lament, that he had not hung Calhoun and his chief associates; but the Jeffersonian spirit of the times would not permit such an act of federal tyranny! In correspondence, since published, he declares that the tariff question was then "only a pretext;" that the real "object" of the conspirators was an "independent government;" and then adds, with a prescience beyond his times, "the next pretext will be African Slavery."

Mr. Calhoun, casting about for a platform on which his malcontents, however disagreeing on other points, might there stand unitedly, was not slow to perceive this ebony one ready made to his hands. What mattered it, that slavery was then everywhere regarded as an evil, and its speedy extinction generally desired? There was the *bond of union* to suit his purpose, and, with the rice field and the cotton gin as his auxilaries, a decade or two would suffice to revolutionize the theology and the politics of his times. So, with an industry and a genius worthy of a better cause, he set himself seriously to work, and, unhappily for his countrymen, succeeded but too well in his nefarious designs. It was not given to him, however, to see the ripe fruit of his baleful doctrines. It may have been thought that it would be too sweet a satisfaction to the traitor's soul. But year by year, indoctrinated from platform and pulpit, the southern communities became more and more fused together, until in 1860 the time and the opportunity had come for the outburst of the great rebellion whose iron hoofs now desolate the land. We repeat, slavery only *unites* the parts; the real *cause* of the rebellion lies deeper. Slavery is only the common platform, the bond of union, the vital cord, which must itself be completely severed before the parts by it united can return to their old condition of peace and loyalty. But it is, after all, only a *condition* of the rebellion; a necessary con-

dition, we grant; a condition which *we* would be blind not to see and allow for. But our real struggle, as a nation, to the calm eye of history, rises higher than the question of slavery, and is rather an armed resolve of the national government to assert for itself, at last, authority and power. The rebellion under the form of secession, is simply Jeffersonianism pushed to its logical results; the war for the Union, waged under the form of coercion, is merely the healthy return of the government to the sounder doctrines of Washington and Hamilton. *They* fight for anarchy; *we* fight for government. *They* fight for lawlessness; *we* fight for law. The battle in Charleston harbor came not a moment too soon. It was high time to test the question, whether the American government dared to return a domestic blow. During those last maddening days of the reign of Buchanan, when the nation like a strong man bewildered was yet struggling in the Valley of Humiliation, we barely escaped "as by fire" from becoming a by-word and a hissing among the nations. The conflict had already been put off too long. Too many insults had been received unresented, too many indignities already endured. The great case of the nation *versus* the states had been adjourned from time to time, so often, that the defendants had already come to the conclusion that the plaintiff did not mean to prosecute at all. But at last the plaintiff, mysterious as it seemed, was goaded to think better of his cause. With much painstaking, he found a proper attorney in a certain honest lawyer from Illinois, and then at length, it happened, the case was ordered for trial, at the bar of History, before the great Judge of nations as well as men.

The first blow had scarcely been struck before the states divided off and took sides. The northern states, mostly loyal to the federal idea, and, where they were not wholly so, without a "common bond" to unite them in insurrection, declared for the Union. The southern states, on the contrary, knit together by the common bond of slavery, declared unitedly for disunion. And thus it happened that the war became speedily a war of sections. The war, thus once fairly inaugurated, resolved itself into a mere question of forces. Chief among these were *four*, to wit: quantity and quality of population, wealth, and commerce. On the one side were arrayed

twenty millions of people; on the other, twelve. On the one side was the puritan, believing God rules; on the other, the cavalier, affirming cotton is king. On the one side were the descendants of those, who at Concord and Lexington,

> Their flag in April's breeze unfurled,
> There fired the shot heard round the world;

on the other, the sons of those who ran away at Guilford Court House, and stood but feebly at Camden and Savannah. On the one side was a purse, which thus far has sustained unaided the most gigantic war of modern times; on the other, a shinplaster currency, "payable two years *after* the ratification of a treaty of peace with the United States." On the one side was a commerce, whose keels vex the waters of every ocean; on the other, no ships at all, except the few stolen or surrendered by renegade commanders.

But now, the trial by battle being once fairly joined, the two stern combatants grimly at work, suddenly there loomed up a dusky element, which the South in its hardihood had evidently not calculated for, if not forgotten. There is now no doubt, that the leaders of the rebellion in the beginning relied largely on aid from their northern sympathizers. They confidently believed that a northern peace party would at least so paralyze the friends of the Union, that no radical measures could be adopted, and that, no matter how the war might go, the institution of slavery would remain untouched. Had not all the parties denounced John Brown? Had not the black republicans disavowed abolitionism? Had not Fernando Wood proclaimed *his* New York should be a free city? Had not the democracy, in convention assembled, everywhere *Resolved*, that if the North undertook to "subjugate" the South, it would first have to fight northern democrats? But it happened these haughty cavaliers, who aforetime were wont to despise the north, mistaking its patience for pusillanimity, and to boast—proud souls—that *they* carried the nation in the palm of their hand, were now counting without their host. The first gun fired at Sumter ended all this disloyal palaver, and soon the war-cry of the people, flung from mountain to valley, was "Every weapon against the southern traitor!" From this hour henceforth the only substantial question was, as to which

side should secure the negro. Here, in truth, was the real turning point of the war. Sambo became the pivot about which the whole contest began to revolve, and the war passed simply into a question as to whether he should continue Cuffee or become soldier.

The progress of the public mind on this subject, since the outbreak of the rebellion, has been truly amazing. It furnishes another lively illustration of the rapid change in public opinion in times of civil commotions. It is not three years since the most notorious of our military leaders, then conducting a campaign in West Virginia, at the outset forbade all slaves from entering his lines, and warned them by proclamation that, if they presumed to rise against their masters, *he* would "crush them with an iron hand." History will not believe it. Who, before, ever heard of a general refusing the most valuable of allies against a common enemy? It is in accordance with the eternal fitness of things, that he has since lost all command and gravitated gradually into a New York Copperhead. Sixty days, however, if so long, had not elapsed from the date of McClellan's proclamation, before General Butler, at Fortress Monroe, by a funny fiction of law, (true on the southern claim that slaves are property,) discovered that all slaves belonging to disloyal masters were "contraband of war!" A broad laugh overspread the face of the nation; but the country was grateful for any means whereby we could rescue our friends and weaken our enemies. Soon the secretary of state found out that colored persons, if they wished to go abroad, were "American citizens of African desent," in so far as to be capable of receiving a passport. Then the attorney general decided, that, as such "qualified citizens," they could locate upon and pre-empt public lands. And now the President, made, by repeated defeats to our arms, at last fully awake to the magnitude of the contest, and to the necessity of employing all the national resources, by his immortal Proclamation of Emancipation declared all slaves within the insurrectionary districts "henceforth and forever *free;*" and then, in a spirit of lofty eloquence not surpassed in any age, invoked upon this sublime measure "the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God!" Finally, Congress took the matter up, and by solemn

legislation enacted, that all slaves should be heartily welcomed within the Union lines, should be guarantied the full protection of the national flag, and, if so they chose, should drill and fight as Union soldiers. From Cuffee to contraband, from contraband to citizens of African descent, from such qualified citizen to American soldier, our national prejudices have grown "small by degrees and beautifully less," until at last the hated children of the sun have come to be recognized as welcome allies in the great war now and here being waged so fiercely for humanity and God.

It requires no prophet's eye now to see, that the battle, though still maintained with vigor in some parts of the field, is yet already clearly won. The elections of last fall, from Maine to California, possess this peculiar significance, that they utterly annihilate disaffection throughout the north. Any other result, especially in the great Middle States, would have been a national disaster. But, thank Heaven, Mr. Justice Woodward was left to contemplate the beauties of his native Wyoming; McClellan even could not save him; and the martyr of Ohio bids fair, for some time to come, "to watch and wait across the border!" Meanwhile, throughout the south, wholesale disintegration is inevitable. Jeffdom is already beaten, because it has lost Sambo. Its ebony platform has been knocked from under it. Its bond of union has been thoroughly and forever severed. Its vital cord has been effectually cut. At all points where the Union lines advance, its faithful chattels, converted suddenly into "American citizens of African descent," take unto themselves legs and run away. Nay, if we but look more closely, we may see the dusky freedmen, with bent brow, in serried ranks, beneath the good, the grand old flag, charging fiercely into the storm of battle, and indicating for their race a right royal manhood along the bloody ramparts of Port Hudson and Fort Wagner. We repeat, the battle, though its thunders still shake the air, is already won *for* the nation. It but remains for the Union to gather up its squadrons and charge once more, or so, along the whole line. For there is no clearer truth in this war than this, that exactly in the proportion that slavery disappears, the rebellion ceases. The accursed bond of union once cut, the malcontents everywhere drop speedily asunder. Thus Calhoun's chosen agent

for building up a southern Empire, by one of those sure revenges which time always brings about, has become to the disunionists an "architect of ruin." Hence, with the success of our arms, we behold following *pari passu* the loyalization of the South and the restoration of the Union. And thus once more we see it happen, in the strange "whirligig of time," that justice to the oppressed, however dear or difficult, becomes at last the only TRUE SAFETY of a nation.

For our nation *will* be saved. The "signs of the times" are unmistakable. The Lord, almost, hath spoken it. In the light of our shining victories, at both the ballot and the cartridge box, we may well believe, that

> Behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above his own.

How gratifying to the patriot! what matter of rejoicing to the Christian heart! With the war once over, we shall have no more squabbles about State Rights. Future malcontents will have been taught a lesson which they will wisely heed. Our local governments will know enough, at least, "to keep the peace." With the only stain upon our escutcheon blotted out, with justice and liberty established as the corner-stones of the Republic, with the reign of law and order made sure and absolute, with a population industrious, intelligent, and inured to arms, and with an undivided and indivisible empire from the lakes to the gulf, and from the blue Atlantic to the golden slopes of the Pacific, the future grandeur, and power, and glory of the American people, O, who shall estimate? Then at last become the true pride of mankind, and the just hope of the world, it is not too much to believe, that our career as a nation will be only just begun. Abraham Lincoln, the crowned hero of the century, will go to his tomb wept by the human race, and the American Republic, saved by his hand, will endure, let us hope,

> Through long distant ages, when these war-cloud days are done,
> Stretching like a golden evening forward to the setting sun.

But a word more and our task is done. There are those who say, that the war once over, the freedmen will be remanded

to their bonds. A cabinet officer, indeed, with a strange lack of dignity, most unbecoming to one of his station, has declared, that, in his judgment, they will perhaps be allowed to build our railroads, dig our canals, and ditch our swamps; but that, when these public works are completed, they will be shipped off to Africa or Central America. Faugh! The American people have not yet sunk so low. Let men remember, that no nation ever yet willingly abandoned the defenders of its life, and that the American Republic in the heyday of its triumph over anarchy and treason cannot afford to disgrace itself forever. And besides, at the close of the conflict, the dusky warriors, who with leveled bayonets charged across the ditch at Port Hudson and up the slopes of Wagner, by that time at least two hundred thousand strong, unless we greatly mistake, with the sympathies of the world at their back, will know well how to take care of themselves.

Art. X.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Movements in the Church of England.—The trial of Bishop Colenso.—Decision of the Privy Council in the case of the Essayists.—A new and highly important stage has been reached in the history of the Rationalistic Controversy in the Church of England. Bishop Colenso has been tried before an Episcopal synod in South Africa, which has found him guilty of heresy and deposed him from his see. On the other hand, the appeal of Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, two of the writers of the Essays and Reviews, from the sentence of the Court of Arches, has come up before the highest judicial court of the country. The Privy Council and this highest authority has declared the holdings and publishing of the views contained in the essays of the above two writers not to be inconsistent with the rule of faith in the Church of England. Both decisions are events of far-reaching bearing.

The trial of Colenso commenced on November 17. The tribunal before which the Bishop of Natal was cited to appear was constituted in St. George's Cathedral, Cape Town, and consisted of the most Rev. Dr. Gray, Bishop of Cape Town and Metropolitan of South Africa, assisted by his suffragans, the Bishops of Graham's Town and of the Orange Free State. The Bishops of St. Helena and of Zambesi, also suffragans of Cape Town, were absent on account of the distance of the seats of their dioceses from the metropolitan city, in each case being no less than two thousand miles. The accusing clergy were present to support their accusation in the persons of the Dean of Cape Town, Dr. Douglas; the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, Dr. Merriman; and the Archdeacon of George, Dr. Badnall. On the part of the accused bishop, Dr. Bleek, curator of the Grey Library, attended to protest against the proceedings, or, to speak more correctly, against the jurisdiction of the court.

After a brief explanation of the occa-

sion of the trial by the Bishop of Cape Town, the registrar of the court read the various official documents—the citation of Dr. Colenso—the presentation to the metropolitan by the accusers on which the citation had been issued, and the articles of accusation by which the charge preferred against the Bishop of Natal is sought to be proved. The charge says, "the presentation is founded upon certain extracts from writings published and put forth by Bishop Colenso, entitled 'St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Newly Translated and Explained from a Missionary Point of View,' and Parts I and II of the 'Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined, and sold and published in the city of Cape Town within the last two years." Dr. Colenso was accused of heresy on nine counts: 1. His disbelief of the atonement. 2. His belief in justification without any knowledge of Christ. 3. His belief in natal regeneration. 4. His disbelief in the endlessness of future punishments. 5. His denial that the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God. 6. His denial of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 7. His denial that the Bible is a true history of the facts which it professes to describe. 8. His denial of the divinity of our blessed Lord. 9. His depraving, impugning, and bringing into disrepute the Book of Common Prayer.

Each article comprised several extracts from one or the other of the two works referred to in the presentation. The extracts are placed in juxtaposition to the articles and formularies of the Church which they severally contravene. At the end of each article the specific charge against it is given in full.

The reading of the voluminous documents was followed, after a slight discussion on what appeared to be a point of form, by the presentation, through Dr. Bleek, of Bishop Colenso's protest against jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cape Town in the matter, and if jurisdiction were assumed and adverse judgment delivered, notice of appeal against such judgment would be given. At a later period of the day the question was raised by the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, supported by the Archdeacon of George, whether Dr. Bleek was a member of a communion which recognized the formularies of the Church—whether, in fact, he was not a "Socinian." Dr. Bleek, on the ground of objection to "the right to put the question," declined to reply to it, and the subject dropped. The court then adjourned until December 14.

On reassembling, the suffragan bishops as assessors delivered their opinions. The Bishop of Graham's Town said he considered all these charges proved, and painful as it was for him to arrive at such a conclusion, he considered that by the false teaching proved against him the Bishop of Natal had wholly disqualified himself for bearing rule in the Church of God, and for the care of souls therein. The Bishop of the Free State announced that he had come to a similar conclusion. The court then adjourned, when on its reassembling the metropolitan pronounced judgment, depriving Bishop Colenso of his see, unless on or before the 4th of March next the bishop shall file a full, unconditional, and absolute retraction in writing of all the objectionable extracts, in London, or a like retractation by April 16 in Cape Town. Dr. Bleek handed in a protest against the legality of the proceedings and the validity of the judgment, and gave notice of appeal. The Bishop of Cape Town said he could not recognize any appeal except to his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and he must require that appeal to be made within fifteen days from that time.

In England the no less famous case of the Essays and Reviews has been ultimately decided by the judicial committee of the Privy Council. By this decision the sentence of suspension pronounced by Dr. Lushington on Dr. Rowland Williams and the Rev. H. B. Wilson, two of the writers of the Essays and Reviews, is reversed. The judgment of the committee, which will be of lasting importance for the Church of England, was delivered by the Lord Chancellor. He stated that it was not the province of the committee to give any opinion as to the general tendency of the whole of the two essays, or of the book entitled "Essays and Reviews." The character of that work, whether beneficial or otherwise, remained unaffected by the judgment. Their lordships had only to consider the extracts from the essays which were the subject of appeal. Nor was it the duty of the court to settle matters of faith. It could only look at the doctrine of the Church of England by law established and ascertain if it had been contravened by the extracts before them. It must also be remem-

bered that the Church had not pronounced an opinion on all points. He then proceeded to a consideration of the case of Dr. Williams. Dr. Williams was charged with denying that the Bible is the word of God, that it contains any effectual revelation of his truth or of his dealings with mankind, or is the rule of our faith. The judicial committee decided that he has not affirmed this; that his language is consistent with a belief in those things which he is said to have denied; and that therefore the charge is founded upon a misinterpretation of his words. The other charge against Dr. Williams was that he had contravened the eleventh Article of Religion—that on justification by faith. He had said in the course of a defense which he imagined Bunsen might make, a supposed adversary, "why may not justification by faith have meant the peace of mind or sense of divine approval which comes of a trust in God, rather than a fiction of merit by transfer?" Dr. Lushington had taken this as a declaration of the writer's own sentiments. The judicial committee refused to do so, saying that "it would be a severe thing." Further, it declined to recognize in the statement that "the doctrine of transfer by merit is a fiction," a contravention of the eleventh article, because that article is wholly silent as to any "transfer" of the priceless merits of which it treats. Upon these grounds the judicial committee reversed the judgment of the Court of Arches against Dr. Williams.

The first charge against Mr. Wilson related to the subject of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and in the view of the court involved the proposition that it was a contradiction of the doctrine laid down in the sixth and twentieth Articles of Religion in the Nicene Creed and in the Ordination Service of Priests to affirm that any part of the canonical books of the Old or New Testament, upon any subject whatever, unconnected with religious faith or moral duty, was not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. On this question the committee declared that "the proposition or assertion that every part of the Scriptures was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is not to be found either in the articles or any of the formularies of the Church." The judgment of the court was that the Church of England, in affirming that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, has not affirmed that every part of every book of Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and the court therefore declined to say that Mr. Wilson's teaching on this point was contradictory to the Articles of Religion or to the formularies.

The second charge against Mr. Wilson referred to that part of his essay in which he says that such is the neutral character of the multitude that neither the promises nor denunciations of Revelation are applicable to them; that hope must be entertained, that after the great adjudication receptacles may be found for those who shall be infants as to spiritual development, where the stunted may become strong, and the perverted may be restored; that in the end all, both small and great, shall find a refuge in the bosom of the universal Parent, to repose or to be quickened into higher life in the ages to come according to his will." It was contended by the promoters of the suit that Mr. Wilson in thus writing had denied that at the end of the world there will be a judgment of God, awarding either eternal happiness or eternal misery. But the court declined to admit these interpretations. The only question it would consider was, whether it was competent for a clergyman of the Church of England to express a hope that the punishment of the wicked may not endure to all eternity. Against this opinion appeal was made to the Creed of Athanasius and the Commination Service, in which the destiny of the wicked is spoken of as "everlasting fire." The court observed that the words "everlasting fire" are nowhere interpreted in the formularies of the Church, and that an article denouncing the doctrine of an ultimate restoration of the wicked, which had been inserted in the Articles in the reign of Edward IV., was struck out in the year 1562. The court therefore declared that the formularies contain no such distinct declaration on the subject as would require it to condemn as penal the expression of a hope by a clergyman that even the ultimate pardon of the wicked, who are condemned in the day of judgment, may be consistent with the will of Almighty God. The judgment and sentence of the Court of Arches must therefore be reversed.

The Lord Chancellor stated that the

Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Archbishop of York, who had attended the hearing, differed from the rest of the committee as to the charge against Dr. Williams and the charge against Mr. Wilson with reference to the inspiration of Scripture.

In pursuance of an invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, extended to all the bishops of the Established Church in England, Ireland, and the British colonies, an important meeting of bishops was held at Lambeth on February 3. Six subjects, important to the welfare of the Church, were designated by the archbishop as topics of discussion, the chief of which are the diocesan synods, the burial service, subscription to the Articles, and a proposal to amend the English authorized version of the Bible. The English government, in general, shows no great sympathy with the wishes of the bishops and convocations. Thus, in reply to a memorial from the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, praying the queen to divide the See of Exeter and create a separate diocese of Cornwall, the Home Secretary has notified the Archbishop of Canterbury that her majesty's government declines to recommend such a subdivision, and also to entertain the general question of the increase of the episcopate.

Religious Statistics.—The Congregational Year-book for 1864 gives the following as the number of Congregational Churches in Great Britain: "England 1,818, Wales 687, Scotland 103, Ireland 28. Ministers newly settled during 1863, 77; ministers resigned during 1863, 215. The number of Congregational ministers in the United Kingdom, the colonies, and heathen lands is estimated at 2,612; the students in the various colleges at 456. If the numerous village chapels, out-stations, school-houses, etc., in connection with the churches are added, the total number of Congregational places of worship may be estimated at 20,000. On the continent of Europe there are one hundred and forty-eight Independent Churches in Belgium, France, Geneva, Holland, and Switzerland.

The Baptist Hand-book for 1864 states that there are 1,119 Baptist Churches in England and Wales, with 1,888 ministers and 135,826 members. In Ireland and Scotland there are 118 Baptist ministers. These include Baptist churches of all kinds, but not mission churches or missionaries. During the past year thirty-eight chapels have been erected or enlarged in England and Wales.

The Catholic Directory for 1864 gives the following statistical statement, which shows the advancement of the Roman Catholic Church in England and Scotland during the last ten years:

	1854.	1864.	Inc.
Roman Catholic clergy in England	922	1,267	345
" " " Scotland	134	178	44
Churches and Stations in England	678	907	229
" " Scotland	134	191	57
Communities of Men in England	17	56	39
Convents in England	84	173	89
" Scotland	..	13	13

The detailed tables of the last census of Ireland, which have just been published, divide the religious professions of the people into Established Church, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists, Independents, Baptists, Quakers, "all other persuasions," and Jews. The table of "all other persuasions" contains some curious and suggestive particulars: 112 people have written themselves down simply as Christians, and 68 as High-Church. Then there are 51 Christian Israelites, and 40 Brethren—not Plymouth Brethren. 28 rank themselves as Disciples of Christ; 14 are Derbyites; 9 Kellyites; 3 Walkerites; 3 Morrissonians; and 1 Cameronian. 9 simply declare themselves Believers in Jesus; 5 as Members of Christ's Church; 8 as Sinners saved by Grace. We find also such designations as these: Brethren in Christ, 2; Church of Christ, 2; The Word of God Alone, 2; Self-Opinion, or the Church of God, 1. One man who writes himself down a saint of no sect; and a man and a woman say they are of no particular persuasion. Two go a little further than the last, and say that they are undecided. Two others are doubtful; 44 males and 28 females say they are of no religion. One is a philanthropist, another a positivist, and another a Cromwellian Protestant. There are 4 socialists, 21 free-thinkers, 20 secularists, 19 deists, 1 unbeliever, (a woman,) and 1 atheist. Two are rationalists, two materialists, and two avow themselves to be seekers. One is a Puseyite. The Unitarians are divided under the heads of Unitarians, simply of whom there are 3,809; Unitarian Presbyterians, 201; non-subscribing Presbyterians, 167; and Arians, 32. Several of this denomination, however,

are ranked under the general head of Presbyterians. The figures of the general return are as follows: Established Church, males, 339,314; females, 354,043; Roman Catholics, males, 2,205,053; females, 2,300,212; Presbyterians, males, 254,734; females, 268,557; Methodists, males, 21,290; females, 24,109; Independents, males, 2,112; females, 2,420; Baptists, males, 2,141; females, 2,096; Society of Friends or Quakers, males, 1,680; females, 1,680; all other persuasions, males, 10,846; females, 7,052; Jews, males, 200; females, 193.

ITALY.

Progress of Protestantism.—The progress of Protestantism during the year 1863 has been again gratifying, and the beginning of the new year witnesses a considerable extension of the territory of the Protestant Churches and missions. Some of the large cities begin to have a Protestant population, considerable even in point of numbers. Thus the city of Milan has already one thousand Church members, of whom seven hundred belong to the Free Church and three hundred to the Waldensian and Wesleyan missions. A literary celebrity of Milan, Professor Oddo, a speaker of great power, and in favor with the public, has lately commenced a series of lectures on the history of Italy in an evangelical sense, showing the injury which the Papacy has done to Italy during the whole of its history, and expressing a wish to see an Evangelical Church in Italy. The neighborhood of Milan is even more interesting than the city. In Caravaggio, where a few months ago the priest and thousands of his parishioners broke up the newly-made railway station, because of the supposed insult offered by modern progress to the Madonna of the place and her sacred shrine, there is now a Protestant congregation of eighty members, a day school containing forty boys and girls, and an evening school containing seventy adults. In Parma the evangelist Sciavelli, an ex-Franciscan monk, has received many invitations to preach the Gospel in neighboring villages. In one place, where bills announcing the service had been posted, no room could be found large enough, and he preached in a field to two thousand people. At Cremona an immense hall, capable of holding one thousand persons, was packed to the door at his second preaching. In Ferrara there is now a regular audience of three hundred waiting on the ministry of an evangelist of the Free Italian Church. At Como a young Waldensian evangelist has the place of meeting, holding one hundred and twenty, crowded to the door, and many anxious listeners outside who cannot gain admittance.

In Piedmont the prospects are still better than in Lombardy, and there is now scarcely a town or village in which a little band of professed evangelicals is not to be found.

In Bologna the Rev. Mr. Wall, a Baptist missionary from England, and the first missionary of that denomination to Italy, has broken ground. The Rev. Mr. Morehead, a young American missionary, sent out by the American and Foreign Christian Union, has commenced operations in Sienna, which is surrounded by a large and interesting agricultural district, and where he has already been honored by exciting the ire of the priests. In the island of Elba public opinion is so strongly favorable to Protestantism that when the evangelist at Porto-Ferrajo was recently turned out of his meeting-house at least half a dozen persons offered suitable halls belonging to them, and the government was petitioned to grant a small piece of ground on which to build a modest church, like that which in January was opened in Rio Marcha.

Mr. Jones, the new English Wesleyan missionary, has pitched his tent in Naples, reinforcing the few missionaries laboring among its immense population of 600,000 souls, and, with the aid of Signor Atharella, opening several hopeful mission stations at Salerno and other places in the district of Naples.

The Scottish National Bible Society is now supporting in Italy twenty colporteurs of Bibles and religious books. Close upon 5,000 Bibles and Testaments, and nearly 50,000 religious tracts and pamphlets, have been sold by these men during the year. A printed statement of the purchase of Palazzo Slaviati, at Florence, for the Waldensian College and evangelization work, shows that of the £7,000 which this magnificent gift of some English friends of Italian missions has cost, only £200 remain of deficit. At Florence a new Protestant weekly

newspaper has been started, entitled *Eco della Verita*, which, under the able editorship of Dr. Revel, promises to be a valuable medium of communication among the scattered Protestants of Italy. Another weekly journal, a Sunday-School Magazine, which several months ago was started at Florence through the exertions of an American clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Woodruff, of Brooklyn, has attained a circulation of 4,000 copies. A religious family paper, entitled *Letture di Famiglia*, and admirably edited by the Rev. Mr. Piggot of Milan, continues to prosper, and to require now a fortnightly instead of a monthly issue.

PORTUGAL.

PROSPECTS OF PROTESTANTISM.—Portugal is at present the only Roman Catholic country which has been without both native Protestant congregations and Protestant missions. There was some years ago a powerful Protestant movement in the Azores, but it was suppressed by force, and the converts to Protestantism, nearly a thousand in number, compelled to emigrate to the United States. The legislature of Portugal has been for several years decidedly liberal, and opposed to the claims of the ultramontane party; but no change had yet been effected in the ultramontane legislature of the country. The present year, however, opens with better prospects than any previous year. In one of the first sessions of the Cortes of the present year a young deputy, chosen for the first time, brought in a motion which produced a considerable sensation in the country. Mr. Levy Maria Jordao proposed the following bill: "Liberty of religion and equal protection for all religions guaranteed." Till now the Constitution (Article 6) only allows foreigners to have religious services in editices not having the external form of churches, while for Portuguese the Roman Catholic religion is the only one acknowledged. In the penal code punishments are appointed for propagating any doctrine opposed to Catholicism, using means to make proselytes to another religion, and for leaving the Catholic religion, (Articles 130–135.) It is certain that the higher classes are generally in favor of such a reform; but the mass of the lower class are altogether in the hands of the priests, and the government has reason enough to avoid anything that could stir up the passions of the people, and give good occasion to the ultramontane party to begin again their old agitation. Nevertheless, it is considered a good sign that matters are so far advanced as to make such a motion possible at all. It also seems that a Protestant movement is in some measure beginning; at least violent accusations are found in clerical journals against two Catholic priests in the Azores as openly favoring Protestant ideas. In January, 1864, also, for the first time, a Lisbon journal has had the courage to open its columns to the frank answer of a Protestant to the unjust accusations brought forward against Protestantism in a late pastoral letter of the Patriarch of Lisbon. This letter, issued on October 10, 1863, is a conclusive proof that the Portuguese bishops have again become alarmed at the manifestation of Protestant sympathies among the people. The patriarch complains of the advance of the Protestant propaganda, cautions the people in particular against the London Bible Society, and then violently inveighs against what he represents as the cardinal principles of Protestantism; that man has no merit of his own, that faith in Jesus Christ is sufficient for salvation, and that the right of private judgment be acknowledged in matters of faith, and in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. He represents the Anabaptists of Munster as the true type of German Protestantism. The cardinal claims that all heretical books be surrendered to him or burned.

Art. XI.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

Bishop Colenso has published the fourth part of his work on the Pentateuch. The Westminster Review says:

In the present volume the proof of the Elohistic and Jehovistic constituents in the Book of Genesis is drawn out in a manner which will be most striking and thoroughly convincing to every unprejudiced English reader. The first eleven chapters are gone through in the most thorough and detailed manner: the one set of passages, the Elohistic, are shown, when taken by themselves, to form a complete and consecutive narrative; the Jehovistic passages, when set by themselves, do not present completeness and continuity to the same extent, but are evidently incorporated with the other from some independent source. It is shown, also, that these sets of passages not only differ in literary characteristics, but vary in their points of view, as in the two accounts of the Creation; and are discrepant in the narration of particular facts, as in the accounts of the pairs of animals said to have been taken into the ark. Now, if the Bibliolaters will absolutely still maintain that the Pentateuch was wholly written by Moses they must adopt some such hypothesis as this: that he was inspired to write it in such a way as to make it look as if he had not written it: very much as if one should maintain that the earth as we now know of it was created in one moment or in one week, but made to look as if its geological phenomena had been produced in millions of ages. Absurdity to this extent will be met with here and there. But there are signs that the views of biblical inspiration built by the dominant Evangelical party upon the phrase "Word of God" will shortly be abandoned by the general common sense of England.

Dr. Buchanan, whose able work on Natural Theology has been republished in this country, has produced a work of six hundred pages entitled *Analogy as a Guide to Truth and applied as an Aid to Faith.* Its method is encyclopedical and critical rather than original. It places the reader in possession of a vast amount of interesting material. The great work of Butler was addressed to an age of deists; and as dealing with them, it showed that Christianity involved no difficulties which they must not admit to be inherent in their own. Martineau, Miss Hennel, and others, maintain that in this pantheistic age Butler does more hurt than good. He simply shows that theism is as bad as Christianity, leaving pantheism the only refuge. Dr. Buchanan's comprehensive work gathers up the literature of the subject. Perhaps another great thinker is needed to work the material into a great argument.

Two able works have been published on the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel, a part of the sacred canon considered by neologists as specially vulnerable to their criticisms. The one is by Mr. Boyle, a layman, and is said about to exhaust the subject. The other is by a clergyman, Mr. Waters, and the two works, with a different treatment, complement each other. That important part of sacred writ is little likely to be surrendered, having the sanction of special quotation by Jesus himself.

The great Biblical Dictionary by Dr. William Smith is now completed, and is considered a very important addition to the apparatus of the biblical scholar. It is the product of a large staff of eminent scholars, and although compromise and reserve are occasionally a necessary result, there is little to offend the earnest believer in the divine authority of the sacred volume.

Mr. George Steward, an eminent Presbyterian minister, has published, from the press of the Clarkes of Edinburgh, a work consisting of ten stately volumes on the Mediatorial Sovereignty. It is a work of an evangelical character and considerable ability.

A new edition of Kitto's "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature" is now issuing from the press of Black, of Edinburgh, under the editorship of Dr. Alexander.

Mosheim's Church History is still thought deserving of republication in England. Mr. Stubbs, the Lambeth Librarian, is the editor, selecting Murdock's translation, to which he adds two hund-

red pages of his own, completing the History of the Church through the seventeenth century from Giesler, Ritter, and Döllinger.

The book of Hawthorn's entitled *Our Old Home*, with its severe satire on English character, makes the beef of Mr. Bull wince not a trifle. The editor of the British Quarterly, whose malignity toward America has been subject of notice in our former numbers, thinks that "at his hand at least" England "has deserved another kind of treatment." Undoubtedly Hawthorne and every other American ought to be grateful to the nation that bestowed upon us the pirate Alabama.

GERMANY.

The lectures of the late Professor Hävernick on the Theology of the Old Testament (Vorlesungen über die Theologie des Alten Testamentes. Frankfort, 1863) have been edited in a new edition by Dr. Hermann Schultz. Hävernick, though at the time of his death (1845) not yet thirty-five years old, was one of the most prominent representatives of orthodox theology in Germany. The above work was not completed by himself, but published after his death by one of his former pupils, Dr. H. A. Hahn, since whose death the present editor has again revised it, and now publishes it with valuable remarks and additions of his own. German works on biblical theology are becoming very numerous; and it is a remarkable circumstance that quite a number of the standard works on the subject, as those by Cölln, Knobel, and Lutz, besides that of Hävernick, are posthumous works.

The work of Renan, of which several German translations have been published, has not met with a favorable reception even on the part of such theologians and journals as usually write from a rationalistic point of view. The reviewer of the book in the *Literarische Centralblatt* regards it as a great step backward. Professor Ewald, of Göttingen, severely censures it in the Göttingen. *Gelehrte Anzeigen*. The only scholar of note who recommends it is Professor Weisse, of Leipsic, the author of the *Philosophische Dogmatik*, who has written a notice of it in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung* of Berlin. Among the replies from an orthodox point of view the *Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* recommends in particular a pamphlet by Professor Cassel, a convert from Judaism.

The Religion of the Arabians in the Ante-Mohammedan Time is the subject of a learned essay published by a young orientalist, L. Krehl, (Ueber die Religion der vorislamischen Araber. Leipsic, 1863.) On this subject we already had interesting researches from Turk and Osiander; but the essay of Krehl contains numerous new results, which both complete and correct the former current statements. The information concerning an original monotheism of the Arabians is, according to Krehl, doubtful. In the earliest periods to which history can trace their religion it was worship of the stars; the brightest among the planets and fixed stars were the subjects of a particular worship. The author discovers in the religion of the Arabians some new deities, and carefully and keenly defines the character of those already known before. He thoroughly comments upon the statements of Herodotus. In a second section he speaks of hero worship, and reduces the reports of the Mohammedan authors to the proper measure. In a third chapter he speaks of the worship of stones and trees.

Another treatise on the History of the non-Christian religions is an essay by Dr. Johaentgen on the life of Manu, (Ueber das Gesetzbuch des Manu. Berlin, 1863.) The author discusses the connection between Brahmanism and Buddhism, a very interesting, but at the same time most obscure point. The author shows that that form of the Sankya-Philosophy which bears the name of Kapila forms the connecting link. That there were transitions from the one system to the other was known before, but upon this kind of transition the author sheds an entirely new light. Buddhism appears in this writing not as a reaction against a petrified Brahmanism, but as the opposition of the popular spirit against the threatening preponderance of the Brahmans, who at that time were at the zenith of their ecclesiastical power.

Of the posthumous works of the late Dr. F. R. Hasse, Professor of Church History in the University of Bonn, two have recently been published: a "His-

tory of the Old Covenant," (Geschichte des Alten Bundes. Leipzic, 1863,) being a succinct, well-digested, and well-arranged history of the Jewish people; and the first volume of a "History of the Christian Church," which is to be completed in three volumes, (Kirchengeschichte, vol. i. Leipzic, 1864.) Professor Hasse is favorably known in the theological world by his great work on Anselm of Canterbury.

The work of Dr. Sepp on Jerusalem and the Holy Land (Jerusalem und das Heilige Land. Schaffhausen. 2 vols. 1864) is highly recommended by the literary papers of Germany for its thorough and exhaustive discussion of all the topographical questions. It is believed to dispose of many hitherto controverted points in an indisputable manner, and to take forever its rank among the standard works on the Holy Land. Professor Sepp is a Roman Catholic Professor of History at the University of Munich, and the author of a Life of Christ in seven volumes.

Dr. Palmer, one of the standard writers of Protestant Germany on Christian ethics, has followed up his large theological manual by a more popular work entitled "The Ethics of Christianity," (Die Moral des Christenthums. Stuttgardt, 1864.) He compares the fundamental doctrines of Christian faith with practical life, and shows that it is Christianity which gives to its professors a truly humane philosophy.

Professor Hagenbach of Basel has added to the large number of his popular and excellent theological manuals a new one on "Liturgies and Homiletics," (Grundlinien der Liturgik und Homiletik. Leipzic, 1864.)

Among other new announcements of theological books of Germany we find the following:

Professor Hahn, "The Doctrine of the Sacraments in its Historical Development in the Western Church up to the Council of Trent," (Die Lehre von den Sacramente. Breslau, 1864.)

Hengstenberg, "Commentary to the Gospel of St. John," vol. iii, which completes the work, (Evangelium des heil. Johannes. Berlin, 1864.)

Ewald, "The Fourth Book of Ezra, its Age, Arabic Translations, and recent Restoration," (Das vierte Ezrabuch. Göttingen, 1864.)

Heppe, "The Origin and Development of Lutheranism and its Ecclesiastical Confessions of Faith, from 1548 to 1576," (Entstehung und Fortbildung des Lutherthums. Cassel, 1864.)

A new Life of Jesus is also announced from the pen of Professor Schenkel, of Heidelberg.

FRANCE.

The latest number of the "Annals of German Theology" brings an interesting article reviewing the entire recent literature on the History of French Protestantism. A brief abstract of this article may be of interest to many of our readers.

Protestantism was never the predominant religion in France. Though one of the great reformers of the sixteenth century, Calvin, was born in France, he did not remain in his country, and the Reformation, therefore, appeared as something of foreign growth. It never penetrated the masses of the people, but remained restricted to the nobility, especially the lower portion of it, to the educated classes of the people, scholars, merchants, mechanics, and the impulsive population of the South. The home of the medieval heretics became again that of the new ones; only the Cevennoles knew better how to defend their faith than the Albigenses. Protestant France did not produce a first-class theologian besides Calvin; even their most celebrated ministers, as Dumoulin, Claude Jurien, Saurin, etc., did not exercise upon their age as great an influence as Arndt, Spener, Bengel. On the other hand, we meet with a number of men, brave champions of Protestantism, who wielded the sword as skillfully as the pen; of interesting characters, who were Protestants every inch of them, (Coligny, La Noue, Mornay, d'Aubigné;) of devoted martyrs, (Antoine Court, Paul Rabaut.) Such a history presents ample material for historical treatment.

The number of historians began with Charles Coquerel, who, in 1841, wrote his work on "The Church of the Desert." He was in the most fortunate condition for compiling this work. He had access to the numerous family records of the family Rabaut, which were the more valuable at a time when but few printed sources of information could be obtained. The remembrance, still fresh, of the past persecutions, the

general veneration in which the ministers of the desert were held, and the brilliant style, procured to the book of Coquerel many readers. The great sufferings of the sixty years (1727–1787) preceding the Edict of Toleration, the dangers incurred by all Protestants, and in particular by the ministers who endeavored to plant Protestant congregations, form the subject of the book. Many similar works now followed. The work of De Felice, on the "History of French Protestantism, from the Reformation to the Present Age," is written gracefully and with great enthusiasm, but lacks critical keenness, and subsequent publications greatly diminished its value. Nevertheless, it still remains the only work embracing the whole period. (The recent work of Puaux on the History of French Protestantism, in six volumes, is of a more popular caste, and of little scientific value.)

A work of great importance is "La France Protestante," edited by the brothers Haag, and giving the lives of all French Protestants who in various ways distinguished themselves. The whole, completed in ten volumes, is a noble testimony of persevering industry, and by far the best work extant on the history of French Protestantism.

Simultaneously with the publication of the first volume of the *France Protestante* a periodical was established, entitled *Bulletin de la Societe de l'histoire du Protestantisme Francais*, and specially devoted to elucidating the history of French Protestantism. It is likewise an indispensable source of information for every one by whom the history of French Protestantism is made a special study.

The history of French Protestantism may be divided into three periods: 1. Origin of French Protestantism up to the Edict of Nantes, 1521–1598. The period of Enthusiasm and Fermentation. 2. From the Edict of Nantes to its Revocation, 1685. The period of Languor and Tranquillity. 3. From the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Edict of Toleration of Louis XVI., (1787.)

Among the most important works on the origin of French Protestantism belong Triquetti, "The First Days of Protestantism in France," and H. Lutteroth, "The Reformation in France," and the "History of the Church of Nimes," by Borrel. Nimes is an old Huguenot city, and was for a long time the chief Protestant city of France. A history of the Church of Nimes has therefore a special importance for all Protestant France. News on the origin of the Reformation in Bearn is given by C. Schmidt in the work on Gerard Roussel, (1845,) who was a clergyman at the court of Margaret of Navarre, and became the Reformer of the Kingdom of Bearn. Valuable information on the origin of Protestant Churches in Bretagne and Normandy are given by Vaurigaud, minister in Nantes, in the newly edited "Chronicles of Philippe le Noir, Sieur de Crevain." A history of the Church in Paris is in the course of preparation, by Ath. Coquerel, Jr. The best information of the spring-time of French Protestantism is found in the letters of Calvin, addressed to "Congregations and Private Persons," collected by Bonnett, and admirably commented upon by Mignet in the *Journal des Savants*, (1857–'59.) Mignet has promised a history of the Reformation, a work which is expected with profound anxiety, as no scholar has a more thorough knowledge of the history of France during the sixteenth century.

Theodore Beza, the great theologian of Strasburg, who has done more for the Church of France than all others, has found an able biographer in Professor Baum, of Strasburg, whose work is distinguished for abundance of material, critical keenness, and accuracy of style.

The life of another hero of French Protestantism, Coligny, has been well described by E. Stähelin in the *Protestantische Monatsblätter* of Gelzer for 1858. New information on the admiral and the entire family of the Chatillons may be expected from the publication of their letters, a collection of which is being prepared by Charles Reid and Felix Bourquelot. On the life of Renata d'Este, Duchess of Ferrara, daughter of Louis XII., who had a greater influence upon the religious movements of the sixteenth century than any other French woman, except Johanna d'Albret, a very interesting biography may soon be expected from the pen of Jules Bonnett.

No event of the sixteenth century has called forth a more numerous literature than the night of St. Bartholomew. Was it premeditated, or was it the result of a rash determination? This question is equally important from a psychological and historical point of view, and equally insolvable. Soldan

in his essay, "France and the Night of St. Bartholomew," (Raumer's Historisches Taschenbuch, 1854,) thought to have decided the question forever against premeditation; but the brothers Haag are of the contrary opinion. Polenz declares in favor of the view of Ranke, who attributes to Charles IX. such a duplicity that he may have had opposite objects in view at the same time. An interesting contribution to this class of literature is a pamphlet by Ath. Coquerel, fils, which originally appeared in the *Nouvelle Revue de Theologie.*

The two principal German works on the history of French Protestantism are W. Soldan, "History of French Protestantism to the Death of Charles IX.," two volumes, 1853; and Polenz, "History of French Calvinism," three volumes. The former gives the history of the parties and of the spirit which moved them. The first three volumes of Polenz reach to the year 1575; the following will carry on the history to the year 1789. If completed, it will be the most comprehensive German work on the history of Calvinism. On the relation of the Huguenots to Germany an excellent work was commenced by Barthold, a German historian of note, (*Deutschland und die Hugenotten*, vol. i, 1849,) but unfortunately it has never been completed. The Prospects of French Protestantism at the time when Henry IV., the first king who had been brought up a Huguenot, ascended the throne, and very ably discussed in Stähelin's work on the going over of Henry to the Roman Catholic Church, (*Der Uebertritt Heinrichs IV., Zur Katholischen Kirche.* Basel, 1856.) The chief representatives of Protestant literature during this period are treated of by Sayous in his work *Etudes Litteraires sur les ecrivains Francais de la Reformation*, 2 vols., 1854. The theological literature of this period has not yet found its historian.

In the second period of its history French Protestantism offers less fruitful topics for discussion. The efforts of the Protestant noblemen to defend the civil rights of their co-religionists may be learned from Anquez's *Assemblées Politiques.* A. Schweizer, in his work on the "Central Doctrines of the Reformed Church," reviews the religious controversies in the Reformed Church of France. Two French works by Nicolas and Vinet speak, the one of the Protestant University, and the other of the great pulpit orators of the seventeenth century. The first review of the history of the whole period is given by Weiss, in his *Histoire des Refugiés*, which deservedly received a prize from the French Academy.

One of the best works on the third period of the history is Hoffman's "History of the Insurrection of the Cevennes." Peyrat's *Histoire des Pasteurs du Desert*, 2 vols., 1842, is a copious compilation of interesting incidents, but has little scientific value. The greatest martyr of the desert, Claude Brousson, (died 1698,) has found a biographer in H. Baynes's "Evangelist of the Desert," (London, 1863.)

A satisfactory biography of Antoine Court has not yet been written, which is the more to be regretted, as his interesting manuscripts have never yet been sufficiently made use of.

Ath. Coquerel, fils, has published, as the first installment of his biography of Paul Rabaut, an interesting pamphlet on the celebrated trial of Jean Calas.

Art. XII—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review, January, 1864. (New York.)—1. The Latin Patriarchate. 2. The Epistle of Barnabas. 3. The Regula Fidei: or, the Gospel of John. 4. Education in the Presbyterian Church. 5. The Theory of Preparation for Preaching. 6. The Bohemian Reformation. 7. Renan's Life of Jesus.

American Quarterly Church Review, January, 1864. (New York.)—1. Intercommunion of the Eastern and Anglican Churches. 2. The Union, the Constitution, and Slavery. 3. Dr. M'Vickar's Argument for the Provincial System. 4. Early Annals of the American Church, Chapter IV. From 1616 to 1624. 5. Lights and Shadows of Church History. 6. Concerning Portents. 7. Correspondence of the Non-Jurors and the Russian Churches.

Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, January, 1864. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Union of Church and State. 2. Davidson's Introduction to the Old Testament. 3. The late Rev. James Hoge, D.D. 4. Can God be Known? 5. Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine.

Brownson's Quarterly Review. National Series.—No. I. January, 1864. (New York.)—1. Our New Programme. 2. The Federal Constitution. 3. Vincenzo; or, Sunken Rocks. 4. Popular Corruption and Venality. 5. The President's Message and Proclamation. 6. General Halleck's Report.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, January, 1864. (Gettysburg, Pa.)—1. The Ministerial Office. The Call to the Gospel Ministry. 2. The Object of Life. 3. Sacramental Meditations on the Presence of the Glorious Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Supper. Translated from the German of Dr. Ernst Sartorius. 4. The Christian Doctrine of Fasting. 5. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. William Carpenter. 6. Dr. Johnson: his Works and his Reviewers.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, January, 1864. (Dover, N. H.)—1. Faith and Doubt. 2. Life and Times of John Huss. 3. Agreement of Grace and Law. 4. The Study of the Ancient Languages as an aid to Pulpit Oratory. 5. The Christian's Knowledge in the Future Life. 6. Exposition of Romans xi, 3, First Clause. 7. Characteristics of an Efficient Church.

New Englander, January, 1864. (New Haven.)—1. Of the Distinction between Natural and Political Rights. 2. The Kurdish Tribes of Western Asia. 3. By what Religious Services, and by How Many, can a Pastor best serve his People on the Sabbath? 4. English Cathedrals. 5. Rev. Dr. Alexander Carlyle. 6. The Conflict with Skepticism and Unbelief. First Article: The Questions at Issue. 7. Relations of Separate States to General Justice. 8. Review of a New Work by the Author of Thorndale. 9. A Letter from Mr. Herbert Spencer.

Universalist Quarterly, January, 1864. (Boston.)—1. The Logic and the End of the Rebellion. 2. The Eastern Church and Council of Nice. 3. Salvation in Christ not Limited to this Life. 4. Contributions of Science to Religion. 5. History of the Doctrine of a Future Life. 6. Atheism and its Exponents. 7. Formula of Baptism. 8. Universalists as a Christian Sect.

This quarterly was for a time suspended, but has been recommenced in Boston under a new editor. It wisely adopts our plan of recording a synopsis of the Quarterly family, with running remarks and comments. There is a sociality in this plan relieving the periodical from the dead impersonality which has been copied, for no good reason, from the old Scotch and English Reviews. The Universalist Quarterly is a valuable organ and exponent of its class of thinkers. Its tone is liberal, scholarly, and Christian.

Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1864. (Andover, Mass.)—1. Athanasius and the Arian Controversy. 2. The Caraites. 3. The Doctrinal Attitude of Old School Presbyterians. 4. Charles Wesley and Methodist Hymns. 5. The Serpent of Eden, from the Point of View of Advanced Science. 6. Confidence, the Youngest Daughter of Caution.

This number opens the twenty-first volume of the Bibliotheca Sacra, being the fifty-second year of the Biblical Repository, of which it was the continuation. The Christian Review, a Baptist Quarterly, is now absorbed in it, and Dr. Barnes Sears, President of Brown University, is co-operating editor.

In the third article of this number Dr. Atwater, of Princeton, delineates with an unflinching nerve the lineaments of the most unlovely of theologies, Old Calvinism.

The article on Charles Wesley is written with great vigor and freshness. It places Charles Wesley (although the author is not a Methodist) at the head of Christian lyrists. It develops skillfully the way in which hymnology blended with the other elements of early Methodist history. We have heard complaints that Dr. Stevens's History claimed too much for Methodism, but his whole three volumes arrogated no more than is compressed in the following statement: "That something of vital Christianity exists among professed believers of every name; that the doctrine of justification by faith is generally understood and preached; that we are not blind Pharisees, or dead formalists, or practical Socinians and deists; we may trace the cause in great part (we cannot tell how largely) to the Holy Club of Oxford Methodists." The following sentence may help in checking the inroads of formality into our old-fashioned spontaneous singing. "To this day the genuine Methodist singing is unequalled for hearty simplicity and earnestness, except by German Protestants and at Mr. Beecher's Plymouth Church, in Brooklyn."

Boston Review, January, 1864. (Boston.)—1. The Trinity. 2. Herod the Great. 3. Faith a Source of Knowledge. 4. Antiquity of Man. 5. The Intermediate State. 6. The English Dissenters. 7. Short Sermons.

March, 1864.—1. Sources of Our Free Institutions. 2. The Chronology of the Septuagint. 3. Bayne's "Testimony of Christ to Christianity. 4. Ritualism not Reformatory. 5. Vestiges of Christian Truth in False Religious Systems. 6. The English Dissenters. 7. Short Sermons.

"The English Dissenters" is one of a series of piquant articles delineating the religious condition of England. We give an extract which may interest our readers:

> The Wesleyans also might seem to be included, yet they utterly and proudly repudiate the name of dissenters, though they are the largest body of religious separatists in all England, with an ecclesiastical polity of their own which is altogether

peculiar; and affect a special sympathy for the Church of England, at the same time that no others are treated with such unmeasured contempt by that arrogant hierarchy. The secret at once of the sympathy and the scorn is found in the fact that the devout churchman, who laments the absence of evangelical doctrine in the sermons of his own minister, but has not courage enough to attend upon the ministrations of our avowed dissenters, finds a convenient half-way house in the chapel of the kind-hearted Wesleyans, who are willing to call themselves churchmen for his particular accommodation. Thus we have seen the regular attendance at a Wesleyan chapel half made up of wayfaring members of the Church of England.

The Wesleyans contribute more largely to the support of foreign missionary operations than any other denomination, though in wealth their rank is not higher than the third or fourth. They have their own high schools and theological seminaries, in which they exhibit an excellence every year increasing. They have chapels and denominational day schools throughout all the land, with an immense aggregate income, entirely under the control of conference, whose powers, extending to the affairs of every congregation in the kingdom, come as near to absolutism as can well be conceived. Their Buntings and Stanleys and Punshons and Arthurs are worthy successors of Wesley and Watson and Adam Clarke. One of the most remarkable men of modern days was Jabez Bunting, who died a few years ago at a very advanced age. A man of masterly intellect and great statesmanship, a power in the pulpit and on the platform, he was the acknowledged chieftain of the English Wesleyans for a lengthened period. In the grand struggle which convulsed the whole Wesleyan body, some fifteen years ago, he was the champion of the conservative portion, in other words, of "conference," and carried it triumphantly against the reforming wing, who contended that Jabez Bunting and his coadjutors had departed widely from the more simple and scriptural platform of John Wesley, their illustrious founder. The reformers included not a few men of decided power, as administrators and orators, well fitted for popular leaders; and the result of the struggle was, not a reform of the evils complained of, of course; when did such a thing happen?—but a secession of a large aggregate body of lay members and preachers, and a new organization, which claimed to return to the original Wesleyanism in Church polity and discipline. Some men of mark as preachers were lost entirely to the denomination, and are now the pastors of prominent churches among the Independents in London and elsewhere.

A critic of no mean power in another denomination said of Jabez Bunting, that he would have made a noble prime minister if politics had been his profession. An autocrat in disposition, a tory in politics, and the Nestor of his denomination, his influence acknowledged no bounds. That influence lives in the impregnable strength of conference after an assault, from forces within, as formidable as any it is likely to suffer for the next hundred years. It is a grand spiritual centralization, "a wheel within a wheel," controlling with an absolute will everything included in the enormous organization, to the very outward circumference. So long as there is strict and unquestioning subordination everywhere, all runs smoothly and pleasantly; but if it happens that a preacher is endowed with too much genius, or too much power of thought or too strong a will, and all with a disposition to be free, he is pretty sure to find out that conference has its Botany Bays, in the shape of very small and obscure congregations, to one of which he may be sent for a term as a means of spiritual health.

We have said that Jabez Bunting was a tory; so are the Wesleyan ministers, almost in a body. The exceptions are hardly sufficient to justify the supposition of free individual thought in the matter. Neither do they always content themselves with the quiet recording of their own votes in a popular election. We remember an illustration. Theophilus Lessey, one of their most distinguished ecclesiastical chiefs and popular orators, having been repeatedly president of conference, was wasting rapidly away with consumption, his tall, massive frame attenuated and bowing like a reed. In this condition he came, for change of air, to a beautiful watering place in the south of England, where we had the pleasure to make his acquaintance. It happened that during his stay the general election took place, in which was fought the great battle for protection which resulted in the complete overthrow of the Melbourne ministry, by Sir Robert Peel and his party. Noble hearted and devout Christian man as he was, and his majestic frame greatly ema-

ciated by disease that was hurrying him to his grave, Theophilus Lessey expressed his profound regret that he was not in his full health and vigor, so that he might throw himself, heart and soul, into the struggle, and lend the weight of his influence to the triumph of the tories. "A fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind." A son of Theophilus Lessey is now a successful preacher among the Independents in London.—P. 92.

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, January, 1864. (London.)—1. Precursors of the Scottish Philosophy. 2. Church History Illustrated by Christian Song. 3. The Law of Circularity, or Retrogression an Essential Element of Progress. 4. Recent Literature on the Gospels. 5. Church Life in Denmark—of Old and of Late. 6. Renan's Life of Jesus. 7. Biblical Botany. 8. The Rev. James Sherman. 9. The Beautiful Things of Earth. 10. Micah's Prophecy of Christ. 11. Biblical and Miscellaneous Intelligence. 12. German Theological Literature.

Christian Remembrancer, January, 1864. (London.)—1. Eugénie de Guérin. 2. The Song of Songs. 3. The American Church and the American Union. 4. State Papers and Calendars. 5. Foreign Chaplaincies. 6. English History during the last Hundred Years. 7. The Church in Cornwall. 8. Hawthorne on England and the English. 9. The Person of Christ—Ernest Renan.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, January, 1864. (London.)—1. The Book of Daniel as viewed by Hippolytus, Porphyry, and others. 2. Contributions to Modern Ecclesiastical History. No. III. —A Few Days among the Slavonic Protestants of Central Europe. 3. Oriental Sacred Traditions. 4. The Old Testament Text, and its Emendation. 5. Renan's Life of Jesus. 6. Æthiopic Liturgies, Hymns, etc. 7. The Tree of Life; from the German of Dr. Piper. 8. Some of the more modern Explanations of the Life of Jesus Christ. 9. The Egyptian Dynasties of Manetho. Part II.

London Quarterly Review, January, 1864. (New York: Reprint.)—1. China. 2. New Englanders and the Old Home. 3. Forsyth's Life of Cicero. 4. Captain Speke's Journal. 5. Guns and Plates. 6. Eels. 7. Rome in the Middle Ages. 8. The Danish Duchies.

National Review, January, 1864. (London.)—1. Goethe's Correspondence with the Duke of Saxe Weimar. 2. What Annexation has done for Italy. 3. Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. 4. Medieval and Modern Greece. 5. Eton Reform. 6. The Administration of Justice in India. 7. Joubert; or, a French Coleridge. 8. The Church and Theology of Germany during the Nineteenth Century. 9. The First Years of Queen Elizabeth: Mr. Froude. 10. The Destruction of Kagosima. 11. The State of Europe.

Westminster Review, January, 1864. (New York: Reprint.)—1. The Life and Writings of Roger Bacon. 2. The Tunnel under Mont Cenis. 3. Astrology and Magic. 4. The Depreciation of Gold. 5. Gilchrist's Life of William Blake. 6. Parties and Prospects in Parliament. 7. The Inspired Writings of Hinduism. 8. Russia. 9. The Physiology of Sleep. 10. Cotemporary Literature.

London Quarterly Review, (Wesleyan,) January, 1864.—1. Penal Servitude. 2. The Manchester Church Congress. 3. Recent Works on Heaven. 4. John Howe. 5. Mexico. 6. Scientific Nomenclature and Terminology. 7. The Latest from New Zealand. 8. Renan's Life of Jesus.

It is very gratifying to us to say, that while the tone of most of the English Quarterlies has been deeply malignant toward this country since the commencement of the slaveholders' rebellion, the London Quarterly has, with slight exception, been at least not hostile. Under Mr. Arthur's administration it spoke nobly; for it spoke from Mr. Arthur's own noble soul. The present editor, Rev. William B. Pope, the able translator of "Stier's Words of Jesus," is elected attendant delegate from the British Conference to the American. We trust he will see ample proof, while in our country, that it was unnecessary to lower the tone of the Review beneath the high level of Mr. Arthur's utterances. Rev. Mr. Thornton, the other delegate, has always been an unequivocal friend of the cause of freedom and the government. A hearty welcome, we trust, awaits both these gentlemen.

British Quarterly Review, January, 1864. (London.)—1. Ecclesiastical Questions in 1864. 2. Longfellow's New Poems. 3. Froude's Reign of Elizabeth. 4. British Scientific Associations—Old and New. 5. Travels in the Himalayas. 6. University Reform and Education in Italy. 7. Revolutions in English History. 8. Modern France. 9. Prospects of Political Parties. 10. France and Madagascar.

The following paragraph is quoted in the Review from a historical work written by the editor in regard to the extreme hostility of the Puritans against Arminianism:

To many readers of English history it may seem strange that the Puritans in the time of Charles I. should have shown so much repugnance to the Arminian theology. In the discussions in Parliament this court divinity is denounced with almost as much emphasis as Romanism itself. But it must be remembered that the doctrine known to us as Calvinism had been, in substance, the doctrine of the Reformation. As compared with Arminianism, this doctrine was understood to make religion begin with the grace of God, not with action from man. Piety, accordingly, was regarded as being more certainly a divine life in the case of the Calvinist than in the case of the Arminian. As opposed to Romanism, and as opposed to external authority of all things below the divine, the religion of the devout Calvinist was the most self-sustained and independent form of religion imaginable. It was a kind of personal inspiration against which kingly power and sacerdotal power spent their force in vain. It feared none of those things. In regard to religion, the king of the Calvinists may be said to have been especially in heaven, and his priest too was there. But it was not supposed to be exactly thus with the Arminian. In that theology more place was given, in all respects, to human agency, and on that account is proved more manageable in sacerdotal hands, and won especial favor from the Jesuits. With the Puritans the fact of its finding patronage in such quarters was enough to associate it with suspicions of all kinds. In truth, they never thought of Arminianism simply as Arminianism. In their view it was a covert used by Arians, Socinians, and Papists, and tended necessarily toward error in those forms. The doctrinal Puritans, as they were called, were men whose protest had respect mainly to such tenets. They were men who must be Calvinists, avowedly such.

Edinburgh Review, January, 1864. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Thermo-Dynamics. 2. The Flavian Cesars and the Antonines. 3. The Marquis de Dangeau and Duke de Saint-Simon. 4. The Progress of India. 5. Dean Milman and Dean Stanley on Jewish History.

6. Scottish Religious Houses Abroad. 7. The Negro Race in America. 8. Froude's History of England, vols. v–viii. 9. Ireland.

That on the *Negro in America* is a valuable article. It enters into the consciousness of the southern slaves as a body, tracing their phases of feeling during our entire half century. It could be derived only from one or more of themselves. It maintains that during much of the time so profound has been their dissimulation, that the masters are the men who least understand the negro. The rise of abolitionism increased both their restrictions and their comforts: their restrictions lest they should be aroused to rebel or flee; their comforts, because the oligarchy began to feel that the eye of the world was turning thitherward its gaze. It is singular how little our researches have penetrated the interior of the common negro mind, both free and enslaved. It is an unknown region to us upon its borders. Yet its investigation, besides its philanthropic interest, would yield some curious philosophical results. The negro is not only a *man*, but he is intensely *human*. Let us here add that if the antislavery controversy is really closed with the death of slavery, another great duty has arisen for antislavery men, and for all ready to co-operate in the great work. It is the education and development of the negro race into all of manhood of which it is capable. Whatever race or class of man is degraded, in a degree degrades the rest. The whole suffers in the depreciation of any part. And so the elevation of any unfortunate race is a universal gain, a victory for humanity. The education, the humanization, the complete Christianization of the colored man, so strangely and irremovably placed in our midst, is not only one of the duties, but one of the highest interests of our republic. Our Church, our periodicals, our pulpits, our conferences, our General Conference, should take the subject up with energy and with unanimity.

German Reviews.

Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie. (Year-book of German Theology. Edited by Dr. Liebner, Dr. Dorner, and others. Fourth Number, 1863.)—1. Plitt, On the Theological Views of Count Zinzendorf. 2. Osiander, Remarks on the Evangelical Doctrine of Justification and its History. A reply to the attacks of Dr. Döllinger. 3. Jacoby, The Idea of Religion and of Religious Life. 4. Baxmann, Baur's Speculative Construction of History and the Miraculous Beginning of Christianity.

Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. (Journal of Scientific Theology. Edited by Prof. Hilgenfeld, of Jena. 1863.)—1. Hilgenfeld, The Gospel of the Hebrews. 2. D. F. Strauss, Schleiermacher and the Resurrection of Jesus. 3. Egli, The Land of Sinim, Jer. xlix, 12. 4. Lipsius, The Ophitic Systems.

The article by D. F. Strauss refutes the report which some weeks ago went the rounds of the English and American press, that the author of "The Life of Jesus" had returned to a profession of evangelical Christianity. Strauss very severely criticises the views of Schleiermacher on the resurrection of Christ, as being neither in conformity with the old nor with the new theology. No one, he insists, can belong to the latter school who does not reject the resurrection of Christ, taken in its literal sense, as well as every other miracle.

In the first article Professor Hilgenfeld defends the substantial identity of the book mentioned under the name of the Gospel of the Hebrews with the canonical Gospel of Matthew.

Professor Lipsius, of Vienna, one of the most competent German writers on Gnosticism, gives another valuable contribution to the literature on the subject by his article on the Ophitic Systems. His article embraces a complete review of the views advanced in the entire recent German literature on this subject.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN, (ESSAYS AND REVIEWS, 1864, Second Number.) 1. BEYSCHLAG, The Conversion of the Apostle Paul. 2. PISCHON, The Constitution of the Orthodox Greek Church in Turkey. 3. CASPARI, Zion and the Akra of the Syrians. 4. WETTLER, the Main Principles of Pastoral Theology according to Paul. 5. DIESTEL, Review of Böhmer's first book of the Thora. 6. RITSCHL, Review of Schneckenburger's Lectures on the History of the New Testament.

In the article on the Constitution of the Orthodox Greek Church, the Rev. Mr. Pischon, formerly chaplain of the Prussian Embassy at Constantinople, continues his highly interesting narrative (commenced in the preceding number of the Studien) of the recent history of the Greek Church in Turkey, and particularly the important changes which have taken place in the constitution. The article is the more valuable, as on the one hand the Greek Church begins to enter into more direct and frequent intercourse with the other great divisions of the Christian Church, and on the other so very little is known abroad about the important movements going on in her midst. The author embodies in his article the most important documents which have been published with regard to the reorganization of the Greek Church since the issue of the celebrated Hatti-Hamayooun of February 18, 1856, which inaugurated in Turkey the era of perfect religious toleration. Among the most important documents belong those relating to the organization of a Central Council, or, as the Greek papers called it, a National Assembly of the Greek Church, composed of bishops and lay delegates, to whose functions is to belong, in particular, the election of a patriarch, and the new Turkish law regulating

the election of a patriarch, as it was prepared by the first National Assembly and sanctioned by the Turkish government. The interesting movements among the Bulgarians, who demand a separation from the Greek Church, and the organization of a National Bulgarian Church, are also fully treated of.

The first article, by Professor Beyschlag, of Halle, combats the attempts recently made by the Critical School of German Theology, and, in particular, by Strauss, Baur, and Holsten, to explain the conversion of the Apostle Paul as a mere vision of the apostle, a mere psychological process. This view, which has been most skillfully advocated in a recent article by Holsten in the *Journal of Scientific Theology*, Professor Beyschlag shows to be entirely inconsistent both with the text of the Scriptures and with the whole character of the apostle.

THEOLOGISCHE QUARTALSCHRIFT. (THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, First Number, 1864.) 1. ABERLE, Contributions to an Introduction to the New Testament. 2. KELLNER, The Dialogue Philopatris. Its Origin, Contents, and Aim. 3. ALBERDINGK-THYM, Vondel. A Glance into the History of the Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century.

In the first article Professor Aberle endeavors to prove that there is extant a direct testimony of Papias to the authenticity of the Gospel of John. Hitherto the works of introduction to the New Testament have adduced no such testimony, and the representatives of the critical school (as Renan, Reuss, and Volkmar) have on that account maintained that Papias did not know of the existence of the fourth Gospel. Professor Aberle finds a reference to a direct testimony of Papias in a work edited by Cardinal Thomasius, who, from all the manuscripts of the Bible accessible to him, collected the tables of contents, as well as other additions made by the copyists to the text. In one of these manuscripts, which is designated as Cod. Reginæ Suetiæ, (p. 344 of the work of Thomasius,) the following words occur: "Evangelium Johannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab Johanne adhuc in corpore constituto; sicut Papias nomine, Hieropolitanus, discipulus Johannis carus, in exotericis id est, in extremis, quinque libris retulit." Professor Aberle thinks that the origin of this fragment may be placed in the fifth century.

In the second article Dr. Kellner examines the dialogue entitled Philopatris, and formerly ascribed to Lucian of Samosata, which has attracted considerable attention because it is written against Christianity. The author agrees with the opinion expressed by modern writers generally, that the dialogue is not from Lucian. He comes to the conclusion that it was written by an unknown

writer under Julian, not so much against the doctrines of Christianity as against the Christians, whose sentiments, hopes, and political conduct are ridiculed.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE, (JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY, edited by Dr. Niedner. Second Number, 1864.) 1. PREGER, A New Tract of Master Eckhardt, and the Fundamental Principles of the Philosophy of Eckhardt. 2. COLLMAN, Life of Patrick Hamilton. 3. SACK, The Diary of John Wesley during his Journey in Germany in 1738, and his Conversation with Zinzendorf in 1741. 4. Catalogue of Literature Concerning the Rosicrucians. 5. EBRARD, On the Age of the "Nobla Leiczon."

Dr. Sack, who has already published in Piper's *Evangelischer Kalender* for 1853 a sketch of the Life and the Work of John Wesley, states in the preface to his translation of Wesley's Diary, that, so far as he knows, it now appears for the first time in Germany. He expresses a regret that the works of Wesley are so little known in Germany. He also gives a brief historical account of the relation of Wesley to the Moravians. The establishment of the Moravian Churches in Germany and the foundation of Methodism in England Dr. Sack regards as two events of the most profound and lasting influence upon the inner life of the Christian Church in these two Protestant countries.

The historians of philosophy generally regard Master Eckhardt, a Dominican monk, as the most profound of the mystic writers of the middle ages. A correct understanding of his system has only recently become possible since the complete edition of his works (written in medieval German) by Dr. Pfeiffer, who devoted eighteen years to collecting the writings of Eckhardt from printed books and manuscripts. Special treatises on Eckhardt and his philosophy have before been published by Professor Schmidt, of Strasburg, in the Studien und Kritiken of 1839, by the Danish Bishop Martensen, (1842,) and by Gross, (1852.) All these accuse Eckhardt of Pantheistic views, against which charge the author of the above article in the Journal of Historical Theology defends him. He also publishes, from the Royal Library of Munich, a tract of Eckhardt's, which is not contained in the complete edition of his works by Pfeiffer.

Dr. Ebrard, in the last article, briefly discusses the origin of the "Nobla Leiczon," which until recently was regarded as the most ancient writing of the Waldensians. But since 1862, when Mr. Bradshaw rediscovered in the Library of Cambridge the Waldensian manuscripts, which at the time of Cromwell had been collected by Morland in the Cottian Alps and brought to Cambridge, but had been lost there, it has become the general opinion that the

origin of the work must fall into the fifteenth century. Dr. Ebrard undertakes to show that the formerly common opinion, according to which the origin of the Nobla Leiczon must be placed in the twelfth century, is still the most plausible one.

French Reviews.

Revue des Deux Mondes.—*November* 1, 1863.—1. Remusat, Munich. 2. Carne, The Constitutional Tradition in the French Revolution from 1789 to 1863. 6. Montegut, The Philosophy of Wilhelm Meister of Goethe. 7. Forgues, The Affghans at Home.

November 15.—1. Beule, Apelles and Greek Painting at the Time of Alexander. 2. Blerzy, Air Navigation. 3. Leonce de Lavergne, The Prince of Broglie, his Political Life and his Writings. 6. Esquiros, England and English Life, (22d article.) 7. Berthelot, Ideal Science and Positive Science. A Reply to Renan.

December 1.—2. Paul Janet, Cotemporary Materialism, an English Theory on Final Causes. 5. Lefevre Portalis, Electoral Laws and Manners in France. 6. Mazade, The Expedition of Mexico and French Policy.

December 15.—4. Du Hailly, The French Antilles in 1863, (first article,) Creole Life, Free Labor, and Emigration. 5. Rathery, Popular Songs of England. 8. Geoffroy, The German Agitation against Denmark.

January 1, 1864.—4. François Lenormant, Greece since the Fall of King Otho, (first article.) Annexation of the Ionian Islands. 5. Xavier Raymoad, The Trial Trip of the Iron Clad Fleet. 7. Cornelis de Witt, French Society and English Society at the close of the Eighteenth Century, according to New Documents.

Revue Chretienne.—*October* 15.—1. Fénélon and his Doctrine of Pure Love. 2. Kuhn, The Morale of Novels. 3. Germond, Christian Patriotism.

November 15.—1. Bonifas, Happiness, according to the School of Spiritualistic Philosophy. 2. Pressense, The First Discussion on Religious Liberty in the Constituent Assembly. 3. Madame Beik-Bernard, Reminiscences of Buenos Ayres.

December 15.—1. Pressense, To our Readers. 2. Roquon, Calvin's "Institutes." 3. Lichtenberger, An Apology for Christianity.

January 15, 1864.—1. Godet, The most Ancient Traditions on our Four Gospels. 2. Rosseeuw St. Hilaire, The Duke of Alba in Flanders. 3. Rollers, The Italy of the Italians. 4. Letter from E. de Bonnechose on the Question of the Bible Societies, and a Reply of the Editor.

With the January number of 1864 the *Revue Chretienne* begins the eleventh year of its existence. The *Revue* is now at liberty (they need for this in France a special authorization) to discuss social and political questions as well as religious, and it has made good use of this liberty during the year now past. Its monthly articles on the great political and social questions of the age belong among the very best of the European press. The religious press of England in particular, which, as a general rule, looks at all

things from a very egotistical point of view, has nothing to compare with it. The editor of the *Revue* announces a large number of articles on very interesting subjects, from the pens of the best Protestant writers of France, which we may expect in the course of the year 1864. Greater attention than before will be paid to the field of natural sciences, as it is from this field that the anti-Christian schools of the present age borrow most of their weapons.

Art. XIII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life. With a complete Bibliography of the Subject. By William Rounseville Alger. 8vo., pp. 924. Philadelphia: George W. Childs. 1864.

Intellectually we are compelled to attribute to this remarkable work the highest excellence. Theologically and religiously it contains many grievous errors. It is the work of a man scarcely yet forty years of age; but from the amount of study and labor involved in it, as well as from the importance of the results embodied, it might satisfy an ordinary ambition were it the sole product of a long life.

Besides the bibliography of the subject, the volume contains more than six hundred closely printed octavo pages. One would conclude, and at first thought not unreasonably, that there is much here not only foreign to the subject, but likely to be cumbrous rather than in any respect useful. But though there are some topics only remotely connected with the writer's main purpose, there is little that appears inapposite in so voluminous a work, and that little detracts nothing from the interest of the book as a whole. It is the most complete repertory of facts, opinions, arguments *pro* and *con*, and whatever else may be desired or imagined in any way bearing upon the theory of a future life, to be found in any book in our language, and perhaps in any other. There is no dry, cold, technical presentation of the doctrines and theories gathered from such a variety of sources, but the style of the author is vigorous and attractive. There is sometimes a rhetorical exuberance and an ambitious indulgence in grand composition which mar the work; but in general there are precision of statement and fullness of information, combined with ease, transparency, and animation.

The arrangement of the subject is scientific and happy. Part I contains four chapters: Theories of the Soul's Origin; History

of Death; Grounds of the Belief in a Future Life; and Theories of the Soul's Destination. Then comes Part II, "Ethnic Thoughts of a Future Life," embracing barbarian notions, Druidic, Scandinavian, Etruscan, Egyptian, Brahmanic and Buddhist, Persian, Hebrew, Rabbinical, Greek and Roman, and Mohammedan Doctrines. Part III is devoted to an examination of the New Testament teachings on the subject. It contains eight chapters, presenting with great care and thoroughness, but frequently, as it seems to us, far from correctly, the views of the several writers of the different books, the doctrine of Christ himself, and the author's notion of the resurrection of Christ, and of the "Essential Christian Doctrine of Death and Life." Under the head of "Christian Thoughts concerning a Future Life" (Part IV) are given the patristic, medieval, and modern doctrine of the Church. Part V consists of Historical and Critical Dissertations on the Doctrine of a Future Life in the Ancient Mysteries, on Metempsychosis, Resurrection of the Flesh, Doctrine of Future Punishment, Five Theoretic Modes of Salvation, Recognition of Friends in a Future Life, Local Fate of Man in the Astronomic Universe, Critical History of Disbelief in the Doctrine of a Future Life, and Morality of the Doctrine.

Of course, we have no small quarrel with Mr. Alger over his theological and anthropological notions—notions which color and vitiate large portions of his book. He is affected, even to a morbid degree, with an antipathy to the more positive orthodox views, and sometimes, as it seems to us, he goes needlessly out of his way in order to be as remote from them as possible. His doctrine of inspiration is indefinite and unsatisfactory. It is clear enough as to what he does not believe, but far otherwise as to what he does.

Mr. Alger evidently believes the human race to have begun in this world at a point not much above the brute. All the notions men have acquired on the future life, or on all other subjects, have been gradually developed in their upward progress. This doctrine unfavorably affects his views of the "Grounds of the Belief in a Future Life," the title of one of the most unsatisfactory chapters in the book. Independently of any revelation on the subject, we see no philosophical reason for supposing that God would have created any such miserable beings as certain specimens of humanity now are; specimens, too, which must have "developed" somewhat beyond the original. We see no reason why the first man or men should not have been perfect, at least in such things as do not depend on experience and culture. Their instincts and intuition certainly need not have been below those of the men and women of

to-day. Nay, more, we are very confident that there are many imperfections which have come into the race only through vice and sin, and of these we take it man was at first destitute, which would certainly leave him at a much higher level than we find a large portion of the race to-day. Of the grounds of belief in a future life the writer mentions ten. But it seems to us only one of these is very important. "The argument from universal consent," we have long held to be the chief valid ground. It is the intuitive conviction of mankind, necessitated by the constitution God has given us; a conviction never doubted till men undertake to demonstrate the theorem and find it indemonstrable; or until men have vitiated their intuitive powers. We see no reason why this conviction should not have been just as strong in the first man as in any of his descendants, stronger than in most of them.

Mr. Alger repudiates the Catholic and Calvinistic theories of the atonement, which is not so bad, if he did not take some of the worst features of these and attribute them to the great body of evangelical Christians now. The "resurrection of the flesh" is scouted with more than necessary emphasis. The doctrine of endless punishment he presents in its most revolting and horrid aspects, and then treats it as "the popular faith of Christendom." The popular faith of Christendom we take to be not widely different from what Mr. Alger himself concedes, only he has great confidence that the consequence of sin will not be endless, while orthodox Christianity is compelled to believe it will. Though marred by these and similar defects, there is a vast amount of valuable matter even in the most objectionable portion of the work. The author's exegesis and interpretation of large parts of the New Testament, though sometimes made to bend to his theory, are nevertheless instructive and profitable.

We must not overlook the remarkable appendix to the work, in the estimation of some scarcely less valuable than the book itself. It contains a catalogue of more than five thousand works on the subject of the future life, with descriptive titles, classified and arranged. S.

The Heidelberg Catechism, in German, Latin, and English; with a Historical Introduction. Prepared and Published by Direction of the German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Tercentenary Edition. 4to., pp. 277. New York: Charles Scribner. Chambersburgh, Pa.: M. Kieffer & Co. 1863.

Three centuries ago Frederic the Pious, prince of the Palatinate, having adopted the Reformed instead of the Lutheran Church, directed two divines—the one a Christian scholar, and the other

an eloquent preacher—to draw up a catechism, embodying the Christian doctrine which the Church should dispense to her children. So well did these two men of blessed memory perform their work that the communion received the boon with joy, and the Heidelberg Catechism has to the present day been held by the so-called Reformed Churches in special reverence and love. The German Reformed Church of America, upon the arrival of this third centennial, directed a committee of clergy and laymen to prepare a new edition as a memorial volume. An Introduction, said to be written by Dr. Nevins, done in his pure and often eloquent style, furnishes a history, defense, and eulogy of the venerable document. Scribner's graceful handicraft has finished its external shaping; and thus we have a beautiful memento of the fathers' faith three hundred years ago, to be handed down doubtless to a future age; and three centuries hence, we doubt not, it will be accepted by a purer and more Christian age as, with slight exceptions, a true expression of the Christian doctrine.

This Catechism was indeed indorsed by that packed and despotic conclave, the Synod of Dort; but it by no means fills out the dogmatic pattern of that violent body. Arminius, too, accepted it, though it was his very wise and just opinion that it needed some revision. We see little in it doctrinally which, with a reasonable freedom of interpretation, we could not sign as a formula of concord. And yet there are expressions and implications in it which, in voluntarily wording our own views, we should not naturally use.

The Introduction claims—and we naturally accord the claim—that this Catechism is eminent, if not unique, in its blending of Christian truth and Christian feeling in its expression. Other creeds and catechisms are coldly and intellectively dogmatic; this at once dogmatic, emotional, and even devotional. The letter is not dead, but instinct with the living spirit. The catechist says *thou*, and the catechumen says *I*, and the whole round of living truth is uttered by the candidate as the feeling of his own living heart and soul. The Catechism is in this most important respect a beautiful model.

The writer of the Introduction anticipates, but by no means obviates, the most serious objection to this Catechism, viewing it, as he does, as an authoritative imposition by the Church upon the catechumen. The Catechism holds him as a Christian, and puts into his mouth the earnest language of religious feeling as his own experience, and all the privileges of Christian character as his right. Most fearful, then, is the danger verified, we sorrowfully believe, in untold thousands of cases, of putting untruth into the mouth,

and self-deception into the heart. Very feeble is Dr. Nevins's defense on this point. It is not justified by St. Paul's addressing entire Churches as truly Christian; for so would we, or any other minister, not as affirming that every individual is truly such, but as assuming it presumptively, yet tacitly leaving the exceptions to be excepted. But this catechetical assumption admits no exceptions; it profoundly Christianizes every individual. Each single one is taught that he is this moment justified by faith and regenerated by the Holy Spirit.

We go very far with the writer in maintaining the value of "educational piety," and the obligation and authority of the Church, organically to hold the children as her own and to provide for them the proper nursery. But we do not admire Dr. Nevins's effeminate prattle about "churchly," "unchurchly," and "churchliness." It sounds too much like the dainty dialect of the dapper and strutting ecclesiastical dandies whom we see in our metropolis, cutting their graceful curves and tossing their empty heads, vain alike and equally of their High-Church divinity and their high-starch dimity. More serious is his most unhappy depreciation (p. 114) of individual subjective Christian experience, which he places in most dangerous antithesis to organic nurture, as if the two excluded rather than co-operated. Faith, repentance, love, joy, peace are all subjective. Justification by faith, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, are subjective. Organism has its sole value as auxiliary to these. These are the end and the Church is the means. And where these exist the object of the whole Church apparatus is accomplished.

In our own Church theory we assume these four points: Baptism, Catechesis, Profession, and Communion. 1. By baptism we recognize infancy as a state not of indepravity but of salvation through Christ, a state not forfeitable until actual responsible apostacy. 2. By catechesis, in all its forms of discipline, interrogation, indoctrination, and intercessory prayer, in family, in school, in church, (which are all within the provision of the Church,) we seek to instruct, to convict, to convert; but as the power of depravity is often acted out in terrible form even in childhood, and the crisis of responsibility is known to God alone, so the Church has no right to prescribe a formula of indiscriminate profession of true Christian experience for all her children, but must wait the individual conscious and credible avowal of the subjective facts. 3. In profession we require a satisfactory evidence that the catechumen has made the truth and power of the Gospel a matter of individual application and experience, and that he has the con-

scious assurance of being born of God; and conditioned upon this is, 4. Communion in the form of admission to the Lord's supper and all the consequent rights of Church fellowship.

Now, to our view, Dr. Nevins and the Heidelberg Catechism are "unchurchly" in confounding the second and third of these two points. "Unchurchly," we mean, in the New Testament sense, not in the ecclesiastical. The Church of the New Testament is a Church of the justified by faith, so far as humanity can attain and know. Dr. Nevins can indeed appeal, as he eloquently does, to ecclesiastical history in support of the most mechanical Christianization of children. And the sad results of that history condemn it, and compel in this country the return to the New Testament method. That method consists in the four points we enumerate, and it is by the neglect of the third point that a Church becomes secularized, and truly, in time, unchurched.

Redeemer and Redeemed. An Investigation of the Atonement and of Eternal Judgment. By CHARLES BEECHER. 12mo., pp. 357. Boston: Lee & Shepherd. 1864.

The author of this book is the brother of the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, and Dr. Edward Beecher, the author of the "Conflict of Ages." For seven or eight years he was pastor of the Congregational Church of Georgetown, Mass. His people bear unanimous testimony that Mr. Beecher's life is pure and his piety fervent, but they were not all satisfied with the doctrines which he taught in his pulpit ministrations. Last summer a Council of Churches was called, according to the usage of the Congregational order, to give advice in the case. Ten or fifteen Churches usually constitute a council, each Church being represented by its pastor and one layman. After hearing the statement of the representatives of the Georgetown Church and the explanation and defense of the pastor, the council, by a large majority, disapproved of the peculiar sentiments of Mr. Beecher. A minority of four or five, one of whom was the Rev. Dr. Edward Beecher, whose theory of the pre-existence of souls was directly involved in the investigation, brought in counter reports, Dr. Beecher sustaining his brother, others declining, without a fuller inquiry into the matters discussed, to offer a final opinion. The result of the whole matter was, however, an offer on the part of Mr. Beecher to resign the pastoral relation, which offer his people refused to accept.

Then followed the publication of this volume, to explain, and defend the doctrines controverted in the council.

The book is made up, we infer, from sermons and lectures

delivered from time to time in the author's church. We confess that there is much in it that we like. The style is decidedly good, being simple, clear, and strong, with occasional passages of great beauty and force. There are indications of much reading and much thinking on the part of the author, and an air of deep devotion and reverence for God is diffused throughout the whole. Nevertheless, the peculiar opinions taught seem to us dreamy and without Scripture warrant. In fact the book reads like a new Paradise Lost done in prose, with a deeper, loftier plot than that of Milton.

Mr. Beecher teaches that Satan was once high in heavenly office and honor, but that he became selfish and used his official power for private ends and ambitious purposes; that this led to an announcement on the part of God of an intention to dethrone Satan and place Christ in his stead, at the head of all created beings, in the post of honor; that this furnished the occasion for the rebellion of Satan and all whom he could draw into it by deceit and cunning; that Christ, in his humanity as well as his divinity, existed long before his birth at Bethlehem; that in his true humanity he appeared to the patriarchs of old; that Satan held his official position till the resurrection of Christ; that the atoning work of the Saviour involved a contest, a conflict between Satan and Christ, and that by his sufferings Christ dethroned Satan, and thus "bruised the head" of the serpent. In regard to man, he teaches, with his brother, Dr. Edward Beecher, that the entire human race has had a previous existence as an order of angels; that having fallen from their original estate, God, in his infinite goodness, has placed them upon the earth for a second probation, and consequently Adam was a fallen being before he ate the forbidden fruit; that those who submit to God shall regain their "heavenly fatherland" and the long-lost glories of the race; and that those who refuse, and continue rebellious to the end of this, their final trial, shall be the hopeless victims of their own perverseness and contumacy.

Our author holds the opinion that in the atonement the divine nature suffered, not merely the human; that the craftiest plea that Satan employed in stirring revolt was, that God is supremely selfish, always laying plans to promote his own glory, and holding himself above all suffering; and that the death of Christ was designed to refute the slanderous charge in the sight of the universe, and thus cover Satan with confusion, and unmask him, in all his deformity, before men and angels.

Of course we will not offer arguments to refute these notions. There is a small class of minds that will receive them with ready

faith. We fancy that the book will be much commended among the dreamy followers of Emanuel Swedenborg; but it seems to us that its theories are too airy and unsubstantial to be received with favor by those who are trying to be "wise" first in what is plainly "written," before they push into "the regions beyond." C.

Christianity the Religion of Nature. Lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute. By A. P. Peabody, D.D., LL.D., Preacher to the University, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard College. 12mo., pp. 256. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard. 1864.

This work stands in a very quiet but very effective antagonism to the dogmas of Theodore Parker. It does this not so much by direct issue as by counter statement and occasional occult allusions. Passing, as we do, in fact, from the perusal of Weiss's Life of Parker to this volume, the transition is from extravagance, dogmatism, storm and thunder, to blue sky, sunshine, quietude, and a transparent air. Dr. Peabody belongs to the school that despises not a classical English style, and dares trust that the clear expression of a truth, though in the "still small voice," can enter the brain, and even the heart, without being knocked in with the hammer of Thor. He rises not seldom to genuine eloquence, not by tearing the passion as well as the vernacular to tatters, but by a chastened enthusiasm, a glow of language, and a rich but highly cultured imagination.

The thesis of the work is that Natural Religion—that is, the view that the unaided human soul takes of religious things—is very imperfect and demands revelation; and that the biblical revelation, though in its completeness undiscoverable, may be verifiable by the soul, and so be found to be truly in a high and just sense Natural. Christianity, then, though divine and supernatural, is yet most truly the Natural Religion.

Dr. Peabody denies that an intuitional religion independently of or superior to Christianity is possible. He asserts the natural requirement, the natural anticipation, and true authenticating character of miracles. He maintains that the inspiration of the prophets and Scripture writers was not a mere intuitive clairvoyance, but a true communication to men by men standing in "an official relation" between God and man. Least of all would he admit that Jesus was simply "a great religious genius," as Homer was a great poetic genius. He traces the great doctrines of God's love, of Providence, of Immortality, and others, as *revealed* in the sense of *unveiled*, uncovered to human view; yet as true, eternal, natural

realities, which, though not fully discoverable or demonstrable by our intellect, are, when revealed, adjusted to the demands of human nature and sanctioned by the verdict of the best human reason.

Something more our views of the Christian system would have added which Dr. Peabody's finis excludes. But what we have is excellent and excellently said.

Sermons by Jabez Bunting, D.D. Volume II. 8vo., pp. 464. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1863.

The first volume of these sermons received, at the time of its issue eighteen months since, a full notice in the *Quarterly Review*. A glance at the table of contents of this second volume promises us a discussion of rich evangelical topics, a promise which is amply redeemed by the sermons themselves. They are twenty-six in number, one half of which were preached on special occasions, as the opening of chapels, funerals, ordination of ministers, and in behalf of Sunday-schools and missions. While this variety may show the skill of the compiler, it also exhibits Dr. Bunting in the various positions in which, during his extended ministry, he was called to stand before the Church. The remaining half, upon such topics as "Christ's Prayer for his People," "The Cause of Fainting under Trial," "The Sanctifier and the Sanctified," "The Penitent on Calvary," "New Joy in Heaven," "The Law that makes Free," seem to have been delivered in the ordinary course of pulpit labor.

Their theology is eminently Wesleyan. An occasional opinion or expression might be fairly criticised; but when it is remembered that the dates of these discourses range through half a century, criticism gives place to admiration of the accuracy and discrimination in statement and the ripeness of knowledge displayed in them. They furnish the Methodist public with a fitting memorial of that great man and renowned leader of their hosts, and, at the same time, give permanence to words and instructions which, in their utterance, moved the hearts and consciences of thousands. They are mostly selected from his manuscripts, and, with scarcely an exception, never received his revision for the press. They will not be the less acceptable on that account. W.

A Popular Hand-book of the New Testament. By GEORGE CUMMING M'WHORTER. 12mo., pp. 295. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Mr. M'Whorter has furnished a very neat Hand-book of the New Testament for popular use. It treats upon the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the canon; the text, versions, and

English translations. It then furnishes a brief Introduction to each book in succession. The style is clear and popular, the doctrines orthodox, and the statements authentic.

Foreign Theological Publications.

The Gospel History; a Compendium of Critical Investigation in support of the Historical Character of the Gospels. By Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated by James Martin, B.A., Nottingham. Revised and Edited by Alexander B. Bruce, Cardross. 8vo., pp. 602. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1863.

The name of Ebrard is favorably known in this country as one of the continuators of Olshausen's Commentary. The present work is positive in its character, yet defensive against the destructive assaults of Strauss, Baur, and others. The indirect service rendered by errorists to truth is strikingly herein illustrated. Their attacks break up the old routine of traditional commentary and compel fresh investigation, and oblige the seeing the old documents in new lights. The believer is thus, in fact, led to a firmer grasp of Gospel fact, and arrives at what appears evidently to his consciousness a clearer and more positive reality. The present work is therefore not valuable to those alone who have studied Strauss and his compeers. It is very valuable to every earnest student of the New Testament. At the same time the controversial element is so managed as to add life to its discussions. Ebrard is a spicy and piquant debater, pursuing his adversary "with a sharp stick," and not slow when occasion offers in reducing him to the ridiculous.

We give a single extract, illustrating a point discussed in one of the articles of the present number of our Quarterly:

> The appearance of a divine being in the form of humanity necessarily involved these results: 1. That the opposition of the Deity to sin came forth from the repose of eternal victory, and assumed the concrete form of temporal *sorrow* on account of concrete sin; and, 2. That the human nature brought with it the constant demand for a *choice* between two possibilities. Both of these assumed peculiar prominence at particular periods in the life of Jesus, when the darkness (σκοτία) encountered him with more than usual power. Hence, in the anticipation of the treachery of Judas and its consequences, his *sorrow on account of sin* reached such a height as to cause the most intense suffering. His agony in Gethsemane, therefore, was not dread of his sufferings, but was actually *part of those sufferings.* And just because at that moment, and on that spot, the sufferings themselves began in all their force, and these sufferings could even then have been terminated, though only through sin, the choice was presented to the mind of Jesus to submit or to resist them, and hence the sufferings brought *conflict* also. Thus, as we have said above, the suffering in the garden was neither a cowardly fear of bodily pain, nor a transcendental outward load of foreign guilt, but the concrete experience of the concentrated force of the sin of a world. And it is also easy to understand how this suffering commenced at that *particular moment,* (the betrayal just about to take place,) and put an end to the feeling that had previously pervaded the mind.—P. 418.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Freedom of the Will, as a Basis of Human Responsibility, and a Divine Government elucidated and maintained in its issue, with the Necessitarian Theories of Hobbes, Edwards, the Princeton Essayists, and other leading Advocates. By D. D. Whedon, D.D. 12mo., pp. 438. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

Antagonistic thoughts awakened by the perusal of Edwards in our young manhood formed the first germs of this work. The subject it handles has, during an extended course of studies, formed a nucleus to which additional results have continually gathered. A feeling that the doctrine of Necessity is incompatible with any valid theory of religion, blended with a dissatisfaction with any existing refutation of its principles, has ever prompted to new directions of thought. The total result in the small volume before us might seem small. Yet in its small compass, we have no hesitation to say, there will be found ranges and areas of thought hitherto unsurveyed. We say this not as boast, but as justification of any publication at all. There are few chapters in the work without some products of primary individual thought; and there are several entire chapters whose whole argument, both structure and substance, is to be found nowhere else. Little of all this had ever been subjected to any but the author's eye before the types rendered much change too late. It is possible, then, that much that appears to the author's mind clear and conclusive may seem to other minds, even favorably disposed, questionable, or requiring completer elucidation. Errors in detail will doubtless appear, and discussion may suggest modification. But the author deemed it his duty, with all its ventures, to lay it before the public eye. His trust is that he has done the cause of truth and religion a permanent service. If that trust be verified in its full extent, there is no reward like the consequent consciousness that he has not thought or labored or lived in vain; no feeling more deep than his profound gratitude to Almighty God for strength amid weakness to bring the work to even this imperfect completion.

A Text-Book of Geology, designed for Schools and Academies. By James A. Dana, LL.D., Silliman Professor of Geology and Natural History in Yale College. Illustrated by 375 wood-cuts. 12mo., pp. 354. Philadelphia: Theodore Bliss & Co. 1864.

This reduction of Professor Dana's great work to a manual size for classes will be very acceptable to teachers, and, we trust, will give a new impetus to the study of that fascinating science. The author's historical method of tracing the facts, so that we have in

fact a history, or rather biography, of the growth of our American continent, gives a peculiar interest to his work. We may note that *teachers* will be furnished with a copy for $1 by application, postage prepaid.

We are expecting for a future number of our Quarterly a full review of Dr. Dana's work by an able professional hand.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Autobiography, Correspondence of Lyman Beecher, D.D., edited by CHARLES BEECHER. With illustrations. In two volumes. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 563. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864.

We query whether the title might not as well have been Autobiography of the "Beecher Family." All take shares in the concern. The Beecher is from the beginning a venerable *pater familias* who sits in his easy chair, while the respective "young 'uns" catechetically draw out his reminiscences. Hence we have dialogue, eccentric monologue, journals, correspondence, regular narrative, and engravings mixed up in a decidedly miscellaneous way. The pictures of primitive New England, though not very graphically drawn, are implied in a very expressive method. The curious blending, in the hero, of childlike simplicity with startling vigor and bold splendor of thought and language, is well brought out. There are a few pages from Mrs. Stowe, which show what a biography of Lyman Beecher we have not. He was born in the year of the Declaration of American Independence. He graduated at New Haven, under Dr. Dwight. He commenced his ministry in East Hampton, L. I. In 1810 he became pastor of the Congregational Church in Litchfield, Conn., where the present volume leaves him. His reputation at that place became widely spread. The names of Dr. Taylor, Dr. Nettleton, and others, abruptly appear. The whole book is a pile of items, shreds, and patches.

There is one story, told by a Mr. W. P. Buffitt, which is oddly entitled "CATHOLICITY." It seems that a Methodist preacher, "one Ames," made his advent into East Hampton while Beecher was a pastor there. "At that time the proselyting zeal of the Methodists was most intense. Their inroads upon Presbyterian congregations were alarming." Beecher left his frightened deacons, went directly to Ames, invited him to his own house, and insisted on his preaching forthwith. Ames was "a specimen of the roaming, ranting, shouting class of preachers, whose boast was that they did not premeditate what they preached," etc. The arrangements of the evening were such that Ames had a chilly time, and

"the next morning the same style of traveling was seen in the street, only in a reverse direction." "Mr. Beecher received no more assistance from his Methodist brethren;" which, if the spirit of Beecher was the spirit of his narrators, was the result intended. We have seen a large amount of that sort of "Catholicity," and it always smacks to us of the true Judas kiss.

Among the personages who dodge momentarily across the pages early mention is made of "Tutor Davis," of Yale College, whose friends all lived in East Hempstead. Here we hope pardon for noting a reminiscence or two. This tutor became Rev. Dr. Henry Davis, president of Middlebury, and subsequently of Hamilton College. While president of Middlebury young Wilbur Fisk, from the University of Vermont, came to his room with the purpose of transferring his membership to Middlebury. But the feeling of the young applicant was irritated by some unfortunate remark, and he transferred himself to Brown, and became a graduate under President Messer. Some years after the writer of these lines applied for admission to Hamilton College, and was called to the study of President Davis. The president appeared to the young eyes of the applicant a most impressive specimen of the scholastic dignitary, and the impressive recollection remains to the present hour. His tall, graceful, slender figure, his snow-white but undiminished hair brushed athwart his forehead, his courteous manner and encouraging tones, are all fresh to our memory now. It was our peculiar destiny to become this Tutor Davis's tutor and Wilbur Fisk's professor. And we are to this day unable to decide whether the one was ungentlemanly or the other petulant; for we cannot think of Henry Davis as other than courteous, or Wilbur Fisk as other than magnanimous.

Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, Minister of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, Boston. By John Weiss. In two volumes, 8vo., pp. 478, 530. New York: Appleton & Co. 1864.

A thousand octavo pages are here devoted to unfolding the life and character of Theodore Parker. They are a monument of the high appreciation of his friends and followers. Our estimate of his *doctrines* has been repeatedly stated, both in article and book notice, and we need make no further addition. In his life and character, however, as here presented, we find many things commanding our profound respect and admiration. He had much of the old heroic mould in his nature. From early boyhood toils such as only the endowed and the gifted know were expended by him in the search after learning, and, we may add, after wisdom and truth. How

conscientious his procedures it becomes not us to decide; but he gave himself most undoubting credit for a conscientiousness most profound in rejecting what we believe and feel to be divine truth, and for courageously announcing before an opposing public the most trenchant assaults upon the prevalent faith. That faith we believe to be not only the basis of public morality, but in its genuine essence and power the condition and method of human salvation. Yet we are not called upon, nay, we are forbidden by the divine Master to "judge" in the concrete case in what relation a professedly and to all appearance a truly conscientious being stands to his divine Judge. How far the eye of the All-Merciful can recognize the spirit of a true faith under an invincible ignorance it is not necessary for us to pronounce in the living personal instance. This, however, we must feel, that if a great honest errorist can be saved so as by fire, very few of his followers in error are likely to possess his profound honesty. By the error by which he lived they will die. The stand-point which Mr. Parker furnished to his followers was too inclined and sliding a plane for ordinary mortals to occupy. The limitations he assigns they will overleap. His removal of barriers never to be replaced opens the broad road of skepticism, license, demoralization, and death. Hence, with a far less objective atrocity, the propagation of error may be immensely more guilty than the perpetration of physical crime. This truth was forcibly stated by Mr. Parker himself: "A murderer or highway robber does not corrupt society; but a man like Choate, with talent, genius, learning, social position, the most extraordinary power of bewitching men by his speech, he debauches the people to a terrible extent."

It was in the great antislavery battle that Mr. Parker won his truest laurels. It is sad to think of a Christianity represented by a southside Adams, contrasted with a skepticism represented by a Theodore Parker. Beyond all measure, of the two, the former appears to us the more fearful "enemy of the cross of Christ." Bitter was the day when humbled and dishonored Boston, bound in fetters and herself enslaved, was compelled to surrender Anthony Burns. Future history, pouring upon that scene her strong and sudden light, will disclose in high relief the figures of Theodore Parker and Wendell Phillips. Those were to them immortalizing hours. Other characters there are that might well implore the silence of history. "Oblivion at any price" might well be the cry of the dark and dirty traitors to God and man who perpetrated the infamies of that day, and especially of that darkest, dirtiest of New England's traitors, Franklin Pierce.

We cannot say that Mr. Parker was fortunate in his biographer.

Mr. John Weiss is too smart by half and his book too big by half. It is written in the broadest and most pretentious Parkerite style, exhibiting "the contortions of the sibyl without the inspiration." Self-conceit, forced fancy, a perpetual agony to be brilliant and striking, do their best in vain to render the book unreadable. The interest of Mr. Parker's own character, sayings, and doings altogether conquers the effect of his biographer's affectations and impertinences, and compels us "to endure unto the end."

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The Federalist: A Collection of Essays, written in favor of the New Constitution, as agreed upon by the Federal Convention, September 17, 1787. Reprinted from the Original Text. With a Historical Introduction and Notes. By Henry B. Dawson. In two volumes. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 615. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

The republication of this, our national political classic, is a very timely project. The rebellion, which has so lately shaken our political system to the foundations, was founded in political heresies to which its teachings are a healthful antidote. Its historical associations clothe the work with a sacred interest. The founders of our venerable system are already invested with an almost mythical grandeúr, and stand, as in a primitive era, the demigods of our antiquity. The revolution of the present hour will constitute the most momentous epoch perhaps for centuries, and will fling those venerable heroes still further back into the haze of "the years beyond the flood."

Mr. Dawson's publication appears to be a "by authority" edition. It gives the text as it came from the authors' hands, and as the majority of them would have given it. An introduction of nearly ninety pages gives the history of the first projection by Hamilton of the essays which constitute the work, traces the facts and discussions affecting the authorship of the different contributions, and reviews the successive editions that have in times past appeared, and furnishes a valuable analytical table of contents. This first volume contains the entire text of the Federalist, with such notes only as the authors themselves appended. The volume yet to come will contain Mr. Dawson's own notes, embracing matters affecting the text, marginal notes by Madison, Ames, Kent, and others.

This is a work appealing to the noblest feelings of the patriot heart. It indicates, and, we trust, will aid the unanimous return of our nation, with the exception of a reckless mass of desperate factionists, to the principles of her ablest statesman, Hamilton.

Sayings of Sages; or, Selections from Distinguished Preachers, Poets, Philosophers, and other Authors, Ancient and Modern. Compiled by E. C. Revons. With an Introduction by Edward Thomson, D.D. 8vo., pp. 294. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1863.

This is an accumulation of choice extracts made by a literary gentleman in the process of a tolerably extensive course of reading. The selections are excellent in their kind. They are drawn mostly from standard authors, express sentiments of high, moral, religious, and intellectual value, and are general models of graceful and forcible expression. The thinker, writer, and preacher will here find frequent suggestions and starting-points of thought. A copious index supplies a ready reference to the topics. Altogether it is a very choice little casket of gems of wisdom.

The selection of authors of course indicates simply the route of the collector's reading. They are mostly writers or preachers of England. We note of American writers Webster, H. W. Beecher, and Emmons; no Methodist author but Wesley.

Belles-Lettres and Classical.

A Compendious History of English Literature, and of the English Language from the Norman Conquest. With numerous specimens. By Geo. L. Craik, LL.D., Professor of History and of English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast. In two volumes. 8vo., pp. 620, 581. New York: 1863.

This extensive work professes to combine the history of literature with the history of the language. Its analysis of the structure of the different forms of the language assumed in successive periods, or, we might almost say, the successive languages of successive ages, is not very elaborate. In this respect it is far less minute than the similar work of George P. Marsh. Dealing rather with the literatures than the internal structures, it is a more decidedly *readable* book. Its pages cost little labor or hard study for the reader. The work is thereby *attractive* throughout. It is a work for scholars, but not for scholars only; the general reader will find his home in its pages.

The old Saxon, though it be the trunk of our modern English, is a dead trunk. It is, so far as intelligibility is concerned, another language. Not only would our Saxon forefathers *speak* a foreign language to us their sons; but if we attempt to be scholars and read their remains, as much elaborate scholarship is required as would suffice to learn German. But German is still living and its spirit is alive, and into its spirit we can enter; but Saxon is dead and its literature is lifeless, and there is no transfusing our own life into it.

The Norman Conquest inaugurated a new period. A series of thinkers and writers, mostly in Latin, but later in that beautiful blending of Romanic and Celtic called the Romance language, gives a luster to this age. During this period the undercurrent of Saxon dialect furnishes but few recorded remains. These few are called semi-Saxon, and consist indeed of the old Saxon words, pure from any foreign admixture, but deprived of their inflections, and reduced, as philologists say, from a synthetic to an analytic structure. This purity of the dialect, while a foreign language was really overlying, arose from the fact that the Saxon population had little use for Norman terms to express their round of thought.

But a third period inaugurated our present composite English. As the distinct national spirit rose, and hatred for France became one of its prominent traits, even the court, the chivalry, and the aristocracy began to use the homeborn dialect. But being themselves French in origin and in their previous vernacular, their English was largely Frenchified. Then rose the beautiful structure of our living English, combining in its different phases, or rather grades, Latin dignity, French gracefulness, and Saxon solidity. Our language has indeed a rare power for genius to wield, and a rich history for learning to explore. Its wealth, its temper, its genius and its history are a noble study for the inquisitive mind.

Mr. Craik's history comes down to the Victorian age inclusive. He evidently is animated by no anti-American spirit. But he knows no American author. He silently concedes our literary American Independence. All English literature is indeed ours. What is England's is ours, and what is ours is our own. Of the genius of Edwards, of Franklin, of Hamilton, of Irving, of Bryant, of Bancroft, of Webster, of Clay, of Seward, of Motley, of Mrs. Stowe, of Holmes, and of Halleck, English literature knows nothing.

Jottings from Life; or, Passages from the Diary of an Itinerant's Wife. By Helen R. Cutler. 12mo., pp. 282. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Extracts from the Diary of a Country Pastor. By Mrs. H. C. Gardner. 12mo., pp. 240. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

The inside of itinerant life is here presented with much truth and vivacity by two graceful feminine pens. We decline to assign the palm of superiority to either, but recommend them both to general perusal.

Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family. By Two of Themselves. 12mo. pp. 552. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1864.

An effort by a master-hand to take the reader and place him amid the life of the period of the Reformation. It takes history for its outline; it can be done only by a perfect mastery of every trace of existing history and literature of the time; but when rightly done it is very likely to be in some respects truer to our mind than formal history itself. The reader or thinker who desires to live in the past at one of its most epochal moments will find nothing better than this volume.

Pamphlets.

Miscegenation: the Theory of the Blending of the Races applied to the American White Man and Negro. 12mo., pp. 72. New York: H. Dexter, Hamilton & Co. 1864.

This pamphlet is a piece of ingenious knavery quite worthy the followers of Fernando Wood and Sunset Cox. It produces physiological proofs of the ennobling results of commingling races; professes to advocate amalgamation; advises inserting the amalgamation plank in the Republican platform for the next Presidential election, and closes with an appendix of extracts from leading antislavery men advocating partially similar views.

In the earlier part of the antislavery controversy great attempts were made to clamor the freedomists down with the cry of amalgamation! It served but a brief purpose. The abolitionist had only to point at the sweltering mulattoism of the South and say, "There is the amalgamation process in full tide of successful experiment. Slavery is amalgamation, emancipation its preventive." Without a fresh importation of negroes the black spot of the South would soon diffuse into a wide-spread and finally universal tawney. "The best blood of the South flows in the veins of the slaves," some one has said. Not many centuries would pass before the complete absorption of the inferior race. But the destruction of slavery will retard the result. Each color will prefer itself. The increased self-respect of the colored woman will no longer feel concubinage an honor. The most perfect legal and pecuniary equality would doubtless result in the most spontaneous sexual separation. The abolitionist is therefore practically the strongest anti-amalgamationist.

Another difference there is between the pro-slaveryist and the abolitionist. The amalgamation practically advocated by the former is promiscuous and illicit, not marital. He raises a mob

and tears down the house if the two colors marry, but is ready to take his share, perhaps, in a licentious intercourse. The latter insists that if there be connection it shall be not lawless but lawful. It is, then, a question not so much of amalgamation as of adultery. The former advocates licentiousness, the latter purity.

We think the entire talk about amalgamation is on the one side *ad captandum*, on the other side unnecessary. It is the duty of every true republican to maintain the enfranchisement, civil and political, of every man irrespective of color. There should be equality before the law and before the ballot-box. As to social life or marital relations, that matter can take care of itself. It needs no discussion. Lines of social distinction do, at the present day, cut remorselessly through all associations, Churches, political parties, professions, city blocks. Christians meet at the communion altar that never meet in society. Wealth, more than any thing else, creates social distinction. All this abundantly demonstrates that political and legal equality is perfectly consistent with social separation. But let the tawnier race become millionaire and we will by no means promise that aristocracy and fashion will not throw open their boudoirs, and even perhaps their matrimonial alliances, to the elegant mulatto. It is a matter that need not disturb our sensibilities. We shall never lose a night's sleep through fear that our great grandchild will marry a negro. We can find nearer and more practical troubles if we need them.

Lay Representation in the General Government of the Church proven to be Unscriptural, Unreasonable, and Contrary to Sound Policy. By Rev. William Barnes, of the Philadelphia Annual Conference. 8vo., pp. 32. Philadelphia: C. Sherman & Co.

This pamphlet takes the high conservative ground of Dr. Bond and Dr. Bangs, that laymen are scripturally excluded from the General Conference. The author has no capacity for reasoning, but his pages are pervaded with a rich vein of harmless dogmatism as a substitute.

Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Local Preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, held in the Union M. E. Church, Philadelphia, Pa., Saturday, October 10–12, 1863. Together with an Appendix containing the Annual Sermon and the Constitution of the Association. 8vo., pp. 40. Pittsburgh: 1863.

This Association, notwithstanding some unfortunate passages in its earlier history, will, we trust, under a wiser guidance, become a valuable organization both for the ministry it embodies and for the general Church. The history of our own city Methodism

would show many a record of the efficiency of the local ministry, and we have reason to believe that its mission here and elsewhere is far from being closed.

A Review of Bishop Simpson's Address before the Convention of Methodist Laymen assembled in St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, New York. By Rev. JAMES CUNNINGHAM, M.D., of the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 8vo., pp. 23. Philadelphia: C. Sherman & Co. 1864. For sale by Carlton & Porter.

One of the most vigorous productions called out during the discussion.

Universities in America. An Inaugural Address, delivered in Ann Arbor, Michigan, October, 1863. By Rev. E. O. HAVEN, D.D., LL.D., President of the University of Michigan. 8vo., pp. 31. Ann Arbor: G. G. Clark. 1863.

Dr. Haven's able discourse inaugurates, we trust, a prosperous career for the magnificent institution over which he is called to preside.

The Bible Against Slavery. With Replies to Bishop Hopkins, President Lord, and others. By STEPHEN M. VAIL, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Biblical Institute, Concord, N. H. 8vo., pp. 64.

The Bible Against Slavery: a Vindication of the Sacred Scriptures from the Charge of Authorizing Slavery. By Rev. J. B. DOBBINS, Pastor of the M. E. Church, Camden, N. J. 8vo., pp. 24. Philadelphia: 1864.

Publishers' Announcements.

Carlton & Porter have in press a work on *Homiletics*, by Rev. Dr. Kidder, which will be a very important manual for the young preacher.

Poe & Hitchcock announce the following valuable books as in press: "Man All Immortal," by D. W. Clark, D.D.; "Dr. Nast's Commentary in English;" "The Two Sabbaths," by Rev. E. Q. Fuller; "Colenso's Fallacies," by Rev. C. H. Fowler;" "Lectures and Addresses," by Rev. Dr. Dempster; "A New Body of Divinity," by Dr. T. N. Ralston; "Contributions to the Early History of the North-West, including the Moravian Missions in Ohio," by the late S. P. Hildreth.

Notices of Shedd's "History of Doctrines," from Scribner, and Wendell Phillips's "Speeches," from Walker, Wise & Co., are postponed from want of room to the next number.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1864.

Art. I.—JOHN DEMPSTER, D.D.

Characters of exalted Christian and intellectual worth, possessing withal distinctive and original traits, constitute an impressive heritage of the Church and the world. The order of events with which they have been connected, and which under divine guidance they have assisted to modify, is of historic value chiefly in proportion as the personal instruments it involves are brought into public view. This is a sufficient reason for putting into permanent record every important reminiscence of men who have made themselves noble examples of public usefulness. They have lived to a good—often to a grand—purpose; and whatever excellence in their spirit and method of life can stimulate and energize others, is the rightful property of those who come later on the stage. It is true of *all* men that "no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself;" and in certain distinctive cases this may be asserted with great emphasis.

The character of him who is the subject of the present memoir had a rare native basis, and was formed by a unique discipline. From the features natural to it, it would have been a marked character whatever impulses had given it direction. It would have given forth a torrent of evil influences had it been formed and swayed by motives wholly worldly and wicked. But early yielding to divine grace, it saved the world from such a disaster; and the heritage we possess in it from the

strikingly useful course it did take in its career of indefatigable service for the cause of God, is that for which the Church will have cause for gratitude during years and ages to come.

We could not, even in the fullest biographical outline, do the character of our subject perfect justice. Its depth, intensity, and richness were doubtless not realizable nor open even to his own view. For this reason, and for want of materials, save such as by much painstaking are gathered from acquaintances and personal friends in recollected events respecting him, we can present but an outline the most meager. No private journal nor correspondence is possible to be drawn upon; printed documents or references touching his career are few; family friends, from whom to obtain interesting minutiæ, are scattered far and wide; and we are left to a large dependence on our own professional acquaintance and observations, continued through more than seven years of brotherly fellowship and labor, to work out as just an exhibit, as is possible under such circumstances, of a mind which, under most unpropitious early privileges, wrought for itself acquisitions and an available mental force scarcely to be hoped for by ordinary men in this mortal world of ours. He also conceived and executed for the Methodist Episcopal Church a plan of ministerial education which, though some time held at bay, has now from its fruits the general sanction of nearly all classes of men in the Church. A better and fuller record of such a man, it is hoped, will in due time be forthcoming.

John Dempster was born in Florida, Montgomery (since divided and now Fulton) County, New York, on the second day of January, 1794, and thus was at his death but a few weeks less than seventy years of age. His father, the Rev. James Dempster, was a Scotchman, educated at the University of Edinburgh, and, though bred a Presbyterian, was received by Mr. Wesley as one of his colaborers, and sent by him as a missionary to America. He preached for a season in the city of New York, but for some reason became disconnected from Mr. Wesley's service, and was thereafter a pastor of a Presbyterian Church in the town of Florida till his death, in 1803. He was a man of learning, talents, and piety, and was very much revered by his flock and in all circles in which he moved. He was twice married. By the first marriage he had

no surviving children; by the second he had four, of which the subject of this notice was the second son. The father's faithful training in books was bestowed on his children as long as he was permitted to live; but John was too young to have received much attention in this respect, and after his father's death he was too restless and romantic to have interest in learning either at home or at school. He grew up ignorant of books, barely eking out a sufficiency of penmanship and arithmetic to serve him at the tin-trading business, in which he early engaged. The details of the manner of his childhood and early youth have no interest other than that they show him eccentric and thoughtless at that period; these traits foreboding for him anything but a hopeful future. All experiments on him failed to bring out any appearance of a steady, unwavering purpose of life till, as a venture, he was sent on a peddling excursion for his elder brother, who was engaged in tin-ware manufacture. He continued in these excursions till the period of his conversion to God, at a camp-meeting, when he was eighteen years of age.

The revolution in him was wonderfully complete. Purposes, tastes, plans, *all* assumed the rarest change of character. To repair his sadly neglected education he sought such aids as he could command; but chiefly by himself alone he undertook this work on a system of husbanding time and other resources, which system he kept all his after life with strenuous invariableness. For over fifty years it was his habit to retire at nine at night and to rise at four in the morning. The hours of the day were sacredly assigned to specific duties, the most of these duties consisting of intense study. He began with elementary English study, embracing English grammar and arithmetic, and a range of useful reading.

His moral and spiritual life also took at once most interesting phases. His zeal was of the intensest kind; his love for impenitent souls was a burning fire within him; and he stopped at no obstacles nor sacrifices to exhort men, far and near, to "flee from the wrath to come." He began early to show unusual power as a speaker, and marked natural acuteness as a thinker. His early career was at a period when religion, in the form in which he and the Church to which he had attached himself professed it, was scornfully reviled, and the doctrines

underlying it caricatured. All around him it was taught in the rankest manner, on the one hand, that all men were to be unconditionally saved, and, on the other, that none but the unconditionally *elect* could be saved. And he was forced, in self-defense, and in defense of what he deemed most sacred truth, to be a combatant. He advanced at once most easily into the habit of a practical logician. He was compelled to study intently the relations of thought as they existed in those subjects which he was shut up to in his early preaching, and as they were revealed to him in the light of a glowing imagination, which was a distinguishing feature in his mental composition. Without rules, without instruction in the art, except what came from his own self-drill, he became a dialectrician. His habits of study, stern, simple, and narrow, kept him all his life in this one groove; he thought and spoke in syllogisms, the major premise being perhaps suppressed, though this was scarcely ever out of view.

To the aid of these processes he made all his studies bend. After the first elements in English came the philosophy of Stuart and Brown, and the ethics of Butler; then the ancient languages; next, calculations in algebra; after these things, or along with these, biblical science and natural science, and every thing kindred to a theological curriculum. Outstripping the most of his peers in these things, he became an oracle to them and to those of younger years immediately succeeding, until the days of broader, deeper, and more critical learning came from the establishment of schools and colleges. Even then, and to his last day, he could bow to no superior among them in dialectic skill.

These were the main characteristics of his inner intellectual life at this period. In 1816, four years from the period of his conversion, his regular conference ministry commenced, and this date was perhaps the beginning of the more systematic severity of his self-imposed tasks in study, which were not remitted till the day that he submitted to the fatal surgical operation. The result of such habits was a conscious intellectual growth as long as he lived. The result declared itself early in his continually rising power in the pulpit. Tradition says, that from early time his sermons were commenced with their propositions clearly laid out, then proceeded in calm, often stately,

logic till the peroration was reached, when the conclusion would be clinched on the conscience, and the refuge of lies would be swept away, guilt would be uncovered, and appeals of startling unction and fearful power would close the scene, to the utter dismay of the daring disbeliever. An affluent imagination flashed light and a rich glow over his sermons in those years, and gave great attractiveness to him as a preacher. In later times his performances became more sobered, more polished, and retrenched of words, more compactly logical; but then even the fire would for a moment at a time occasionally stream out at the joints.

We have sought by correspondence, but have failed to obtain any important incidents connected with his early ministry which could give special interest to a chronological notice. We are compelled therefore to present less of details of his life and labors than is desirable, and to confine ourselves to general views of his character and of the work which he has done for the Church. But such incidents and such references to records and minutes as have transpired show him to have begun to preach three months after his conversion, and to have continued to preach, more or less, under the presiding elder, the Rev. Charles Giles, now surviving, till his admission into the Genesee Conference, in 1816. Owing to very doubtful health, he was continued a probationer in conference four years. His first field of labor was the St. Lawrence Circuit, Lower Canada District. The Rev. George Peck, D.D., who is now the only surviving member of the class of thirteen with which Dempster was admitted, says of him that "his first circuit was a vast field, most of it a wilderness. During the cold season his horse broke down, and he went to his appointments on foot. His boots gave out, but he went on still, his feet constantly wet with snow-water; nothing daunted, he must meet his appointments. His soul blazed, while his poor body shivered and withered under hardships too terrible for humanity to endure. It is not surprising that the next conference found him in a broken down condition. His next appointment was to Paris, an important station, though one which required little but Sabbath labor. The appointment was regarded by some of the old preachers as a doubtful experiment, but it was a decided success."

We pass over a few years here with barely mentioning his successive appointments from 1818 to 1835. He was two years at Watertown; one year at Scipio, and superannuated the next year; at Watertown again, two years; at Homer, one year; at Auburn, one year; at Rochester, two years; at Cazenovia, two years; then presiding elder on Cayuga District, Oneida Conference, four years; and on conference division again, presiding elder on Black River District, in the Black River Conference, two years, when his health failed, and he sought to recruit it by a winter residence in St. Augustine, Florida. These were all important places, and he filled them with great satisfaction to the people, leaving among them decided impressions of his power as a preacher. Fathers and mothers in our Israel at this day love to descant on reminiscences of his sweeping logic and eloquence in those years.

During this ministerial career, especially the latter part of it, his zeal for the cause of God was of the missionary type, ever making him desirous of breaking new ground in the itinerant work. God had given to him a natural poetic fervor; a romantic hopefulness was inwoven with his mental constitution; and divine grace turned all impulses of a natural character into pioneer channels, as well when he entered on the higher plane of a spiritual life as before this, when he was living in youthful wildness and worldliness; so that, to apply one of his favorite figures to himself, this made him, while presiding elder for six years, "like a stream of light" darting through the land, setting up new landmarks, establishing new outposts, and enlarging the borders generally of the Zion which he superintended. Constituted as he was, he was sadly at ease when he could see no progress. He rejoiced in the successes and prospects of our missionary work at home and abroad.

And just here, with his health still requiring a change of climate, and with his long-sustained zeal still unquenched, he complied gladly with the invitation of the Board at New York to go as missionary to Buenos Ayres, South America. Among the Protestants of that city and surrounding country he labored with unintermitting success for six years. The population was shifting and transient for a considerable part, but he gathered respectable congregations, erected a fine church edifice, established day and Sunday-schools, and saw promising results to his labors.

It was to him a new material, however, that he worked upon; a new atmosphere that he breathed; and a new turn was beginning to take place in his intellectual life. From this time his sermons took a character, as if suited to more homogeneous and intelligent audiences; pruned of excrescences, but shorn also of their former spirit-stirring power. Confined to one people, and they a mere handful amid the Romanist multitudes of that city, he was not surrounded by the excitements that could inspire the lofty flights of his pulpit genius of olden time, so he poured a considerable part of the enthusiasm natural to him into the grand conception that was to have embodiment and immortal realization in the years to come. Rising to the intellectual level, and sharing in all the sympathies of this conception, every energy of his mind had now its sphere of work on a plane higher than before, and its tasks were redoubled because the plane was still ascending. And equal to the task and struggle now inaugurated was that iron will of his nature, never yet conquered in any corresponding contest, and never to be conquered. Sermons, studies—all—were now raised to this plane, the theater of his mind's working from this time forward.

It was not, then, that he had less zeal than formerly, nor less fire of intellect; but if they appeared less in overmastering discourses, it was because they were taken up into an enterprise of another class, equally sacred, and of vaster compass. While he was presiding elder he was unusually exercised with the greatness of the preacher's work, with the need of more "workmen that need not be ashamed," with the need too of schools for special training with reference to this work. And the impression deepened, and was wrought, while he was in South America, into the purpose of devoting his powers, when he should return, to the building up of special training schools for the ministry. He knew that he had a mountain barrier of prejudice and opposition to scale in reaching his object; but his resolution was fixed, and he committed himself to the work.

Returning from Buenos Ayres in 1842, he took by appointment the pastoral charge, in New York city, of Vestry-street Church one year, then of Mulberry-street Church two years. Meanwhile he consulted, corresponded, and agitated generally

concerning the project that lay deep in his soul. He felt his way into the sentiments and sympathies of a few friends, whom he brought to his help, and gathering this little strength he reconnoitered for a location where first to begin, and found Newbury, Vermont, a favorable point for the initiation of the movement, but in a short time settled permanently the first Biblical Institute at Concord, New Hampshire. Here, in 1847, John Dempster, Osmon C. Baker, and Charles Adams, colleagues in instruction, consecrated this infant seminary to God and the Church—the result of long years of prayer and faith and labor and struggle between hope and fear; and the small band of students gathered there as its first class joined with this Faculty in daily earnest intercessions at the throne of grace, in public and in private, that this institution should be owned and blessed of God, and indorsed by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Those prayers have been answered. As a reward for enduring, for conscience' sake, obloquy and struggle, which at that time would have been endured by no man less fitted by nature with a strong will and a hopeful spirit, and less endowed by grace with a fervor in a good cause which no indifference, no opposition, no ridicule could quench; a starting point that could not be forfeited to the enterprise was now secured to this good man. He had by this time gained hundreds of friends who before were indifferent, some of whom became the warmest supporters of, and rendered generous material aid to, the enterprise. He traveled thousands of miles, in this country and in Great Britain, making friends and getting funds for it; and after acting seven years as agitator, financier, and instructor, as soon as the institution seemed securely anchored in the interest and affections of the surrounding conferences he resigned it to good hands, to be matured into a fitting character for permanent usefulness, and departed, to pioneer again his grand conception somewhere in the Great West.

Providence went before him. A lady of wealth and great excellence of character had devised by will, in properties situated in the city of Chicago, a sufficient endowment of a theological institution for the Methodist Episcopal Church, to be located within or near the city of Chicago. This fact was known to but few persons, who, when made aware that Dr. Dempster

was seeking a desirable location in the West, warmly invited him to act with them in establishing the preliminary school to what soon after became by charter the "Garrett Biblical Institute," at Evanston. To his glowing faith in Providence, this was a message directly from heaven. He stepped at once into this open door, and was shortly installed, with two teachers, as an instructor of nineteen students for the first year. This preliminary arrangement closing in 1855–6, on the death of Mrs. Garrett, the founder, the permanent Faculty was organized, with himself, by courtesy of his colleagues, titled as the Senior Professor.

Accustomed as he had been to opposition, or at least to indifference and neglect, with reference to this (to him) most sacred calling of founding theological schools in the Methodist Episcopal Church, it did not occur to him but that he should have considerable of the same experience in the West. But he was disappointed; and several reasons existed why he should be. His name, of forty years' high standing in the Church, had traveled long in advance of his coming westward. His successes, already achieved in an enterprise to which his life was *sworn;* achieved in the face of banter, and travesty, and cold indifference, and honest opposition; had also some time preceded his arrival. Society, too, in the West, particularly in the North-west, has not yet settled so compactly into a cast-iron mould as to be unimpressible at the proposal of just measures, even if they *be* novel. An unexpected bequest of great munificence for a Church object, which, with some ancient people, had been outlawed as a reprehensible innovation, produced no flutter here, except of wonder and gratitude; not even in a whole General Conference, which, at that juncture, was assembled in the West. It was an event of Providence, ordered no doubt to *compel* respect for, and then adoption by General Conference of, Biblical Institutes as a recognized agency in the Church for ministerial qualifications. These things made the advent of Dr. Dempster in the West unexpectedly welcome. The work which he felt himself specially called to accomplish, he found, on entering upon it, almost ready formed and prepared to his hand.

It was his own conviction, as well as that of those best acquainted with all sides of his character, that his peculiar mission was to take the position mainly of a pioneer in this work.

He analyzed well the elements of his enterprise, and succeeded in its incipient construction to a degree which any other man, at such a juncture of circumstances in the Church, perhaps could not have reached. Hence he laid plans to proceed still further west and establish similar institutions, first, on the banks of the Platte, at its junction with the Missouri; and next, in California. Steps were taken for the first, but failed, chiefly because of the financial crash that fell on the entire country at the time. This revulsion interrupted the rapid increase of population in the states and territories surrounding the intended location; certain enterprises failed also, which were undertaken by men who were to aid in founding the school; and, this field not having an immediate look of promise, he turned his attention to California. By overtures made in correspondence with the conference of ministers in that state, he was contemplating a journey thither on or about the first of January, 1864. His purpose was, partly to benefit his health, but more to see if, notwithstanding the pressure of debts upon their University, a respectable appropriation from his own resources, added to an earnest special home effort to raise funds, might not soon lead to the establishment of the new institution. It was his declared purpose to give fifteen thousand dollars to this object.

He was convinced that what further work was to be done by him in this line for his Master must be done soon. The weight of years was growing consciously heavier upon him. His health—always precarious since the early years of his ministry, and requiring to be daily guarded by the observance of abstemious diet, stated bodily exercise, regular hours of sleep, and the like—was, during his last year, made more and more feeble by aggravating pains from a tumor of some years' standing. The removal of this tumor he deemed necessary to fit him to endure the voyage to California. The surgeon encouraged him, mistaking the force of his will for the capabilities of his weak, frail frame. The operation proved fatal. He died, after three and a half days of intense bodily pain, November 28, 1863; *and his end was peace.*

To close this sketch abruptly here, would be to offend proprieties due to a serious and just biographical account. Every good man's life brings forth some notable lessons which should

not fail of opportunity to teach others to be greatly worthy and useful. The character of John Dempster had in it points of abundantly instructive interest, all of which cannot, of course, be presented in the limits to which this article is confined; but the attempt to exhibit a few prominent features of his inner life, however delicate the task, will be expected and demanded. As best we can, then—though, from the nature of the case, at the hazard of some repetition—we will attempt to speak first of his religious character.

In the hedge surrounding the camp-meeting area where he was converted, he is said to have struggled alone the whole night in despair, till the morning sun arose, when the glory of the Sun of righteousness burst also into his soul, and spread light and love through his whole being. From that time, it is said, no man could have exhibited a greater internal and external change. Always, before, on a high key of hilarious enjoyment; now, solemn, and seldom smiling, his soul had inward rejoicing, but was burdened for sinners; and he bore ill also some dark questions in theology. Though this gave his aspect a somewhat somber cast, he was, nevertheless, by nature, a cheerful and hopeful man. It was not common to see him despondent in practical matters and difficulties. Cheerfulness was a marked social feature with him later in life; and if the tradition be true that "he never laughed" in the first part of his religious life, it was because he fell, perhaps unconsciously, into the grave and reverent style of the ministry of that day, or the reaction from his former habits rendered him fixed and unelastic, or the prospective misery of doomed sinners vividly possessed him and made him a weeping Jeremiah, or these all conjoined to produce such an effect. On a camp-meeting occasion, some time after his conversion, Dr. Peck says, "he was in a perfect flame every moment, and when he was not speaking to some one on the subject of religion, he was breathing out prayer, or sighing and weeping over the perilous condition of sinners."

His Christian zeal continued of this type, in the main; though of course, as life advanced, it passed a series of modifications consequent to every one on social changes, on changes in religious measures, on diminished show of emotion produced by increased intellectual tone, and the like; but he lived in habit-

ual prayer, and had, as a special peculiarity, great power with God *in* prayer.

He seldom referred to the past, and often seemed disinclined to speak about inward troubles in religious experience. But to a few it was known that certain problems of Theodicy had often cast dark shadows over his spirit, and that he had, at one or more times in his life, to use his own expressive language on the subject, "approached almost to the verge of insanity in respect to them." He became clear of dark doubts, however, after hard struggles, and after processes of severe ratiocination to overthrow them. But they shaded his pathway occasionally, by signs still of their forthcoming, and sent him to his wonted practice of doing again and again a vigorous battling against them.

Nothing else so easily explains his almost exclusive mental toil within this department of thought. During the larger part of his ministry, his sermons partook of discussion upon some point of the divine ethics, or involved vindication of some aspects of the divine government. In his professorial life the burden of his lectures was upon the related topics of natural theology: revealed theology he left mostly to oral teaching. These things show how deeply his soul entered into such questions; how much he supposed the discussion of them was necessary to the drift of others' felt wants, as well as his own; and they give intimations of silent sighings which no mortal ear was privy to, in relation to enigmas in the working of a free, almighty Providence over a universe of intelligent and responsible beings.

That it was his wont to linger, fondly linger, in this department of thought, is to be accounted for, in part, from the relief his mind felt in his confirmed habit of vigilance in guarding all points whence, otherwise, troops of doubts would come rushing upon him. And that he refrained from alluding to one of the probably real causes of his loving to linger here; that he uttered his conclusions here from rigidly logical premises, without ever openly hinting at the sad distress that impelled him for dear life to search out those premises, arose, in part no doubt, from his shrinking from the world's gaze into a sorrow which he desired should be breathed out to God alone. There was a depth to his nature, and, as grace wrought upon it, to his piety

also, which the world was never permitted to pierce. When the troublesome problems were solved and settled, beyond the power of any capering doubt thereafter to disturb, then was he happy in the harmony of his soul with God. He had long yielded his affections to God, but now his intellect was more clearly at one with him. He walked with God, and, in a sense, lived *in* him. The divine communion was sweetly pervasive, reaching down, down, all around, and throughout all the capacities of his being.

All perplexities in nature over, the revealed economy became to him the easiest possible thing to embrace. No occasion existed to him for even a moment's defense of it. To his receiving faith, it was to every word and to the jot and the tittle accepted. The grounds for its reception lay back in the character of God. Prove *that* to be supremely just and good, without shock or jar to reason in the realm of Providence or government, and his mind scarcely needed aught else more final to the evidence of the divine word. Yet the evidences of Scripture he did not ignore. But in treating of their nature, whether external or internal, nothing fundamental to his argument could be seen except what pertained, after all, to the divine character of its Author. The connection of this with miracle, or with prophecy, or with providentially-ordered testimony, or with self-evidencing truth, was all the importance or value that each possessed. His trust in the Scriptures, therefore, resulted largely from *à priori* grounds of evidence.

This was his tendency—perhaps eccentricity—an eccentricity that rendered him liable to the charge of begging the whole question of scripture evidence. Yet his position on this subject did not necessarily cage him in this trap, for he could avail himself of all the usual arguments besides. But that which met his own personal want was a prior foundation to rest upon. Beyond this, all was secure enough to his soul, if only this be to his mind unmistakably secure. Hence the Scriptures became a solid comfort to him in his lowly devotions. His imagination basked in the light they throw on nature's pages. He soared in the occasional use of their imagery, both in his descriptions of the heavenly state, and when, with terrible power, he depicted the horrors of the lost. He bowed to their authority as implicitly as he would to utterances directly to his ear from the skies. So

childlike was his faith when antecedent problems were not in question.

To one observing, for years, the emotional incitements that stimulated his thought in lecture, in preaching, in conversation, and in common assemblages social and religious, such would seem the legitimate interpretation of his attitude as a religious man. The warmth peculiar to his early devotion was less manifest, not because he necessarily *had* less, but because his field of religious view was amazingly enlarged, and because of the multitudinous objects therein, doctrinal, religious, and speculative, each of which required and divided his interest. But whatever may have been the lack of warmth he did show, he was a deeply devout man. In ordinary devotions his soul thrilled in referring to the atoning mercy of his Saviour, and to the possible recovery of lost man through the divine propitiation. The doctrine of the atonement was above all things *precious* to him. He staked his soul's eternal welfare upon it, because he knew no other way possible to reason or faith by which he could be saved. In humble dependence on this precious doctrine he lived and died.

This representation, however, must not be understood to imply that he was faultless. He had faults, as everybody has faults, and because, like every one else, he was finite. The boundary line that incloses the area of every man's functions and possibilities, is almost infinitely various in the diagram forms it makes. While in the case of a small class of persons it may make a wave-curve, or at least not a disagreeably sinuous outline, yet in the majority of cases it is more or less a zigzag periphery, starting in a line that jerks with entering, then sometimes with long salient angles, and so proceeds till it comes round to the point of beginning. Possibilities of character that are realized within such areas make what are called *angular* characters. And it is not prejudicing the case to state that the adjustment of features in Dr. Dempster's mind naturally caused him to fall into this type of character. He had such a constitutional condition of affections and faculties as sometimes made him prone to shoot far out into salient and sharp points of opinion and practice, namely, a strong innate *selfhood*, which showed its distinctive form in a propensity for possession; a will that knew no bending when set to accomplish

an object; a logical faculty that sought its favorite premises mostly from interpretations of the mind's own structure; and an imagination which, if at any time not duly regulated by co-ordinate powers, was wont to shed an intense glare and coloring on one or two sides of a subject and leave other sides too much in the dark. Had he been swayed by wholly unregenerate motives, it would have been the property of the first of these, united with the second, to urge on in its bent, and permit no hindering; united with the third, to decide on mistaken methods and objects of saving; united with the last, to sacrifice comfort and ease and style and pleasure, in view of the undimmed luster that would ever have gilded its ultimate object of interest and pursuit.

But this constitutional condition was under the control of divine grace. And yet what was constitutional could not be unmade even by grace; and do as he would or might do, with such a native adjustment, subject himself to economy and self-denial, as a means to a good end, as much as he might, he nevertheless suffered often before the world, simply because on this point the world could not understand him. Seeing this, he seldom or never stopped to explain himself to a misapprehending world, and made no change in his course. He early adopted a style of economy and self-denial, which was continued through life, and necessarily brought with it continually increasing savings. But the desire to save was certainly subjected to higher objects and employments. He was too spiritual to allow other than a subordinate place to such desire. He was too intellectual to be able to afford more than the necessary moments to its gratification. He was too absorbed in his life-purpose to establish "schools of the prophets" in all needy localities, to be able to love mere accumulation for its own sake. And so would he have proved, most undoubtedly, had life been spared to him. He hoped for a short period of active career still in which to close up his affairs, with a view to a beneficent appropriation.

There are not even a *few* persons in this world whose course in all respects is to be commended. And he, doubtless, was not blind to faults which, were he to start life again, with pliant influences to begin with, would surely have received attempted correction. Perhaps, however, neither two, nor

two score, of successive probations, each refining on its predecessor, would avail to rid us of some obnoxious traits. We are so hemmed in by limitations; that is to say, we have such short range to our possibilities and means of knowledge, we make up our judgments from premises so insufficient, and we trust so tenaciously to convictions which the slightest illusions will color, that a discriminating and comprehensive charity toward men's faults is a most becoming virtue for every one. The subject of this memoir had this virtue to a commendable degree. Immediate contact with influences or conduct disturbing his interest or his complacency affected him as it affects men generally. But he was generous in his ordinary estimates of the talents and the virtues of men. He had a kind heart. He seldom spoke ill of people; seldom mentioned even their obvious faults. But he was often profuse of remarks in regard to their talents, carrying his admiration in some cases to a questionable extent. Indeed, he was so subjective in mental habit that he studied human character poorly. He applied a wonderful concentration of thought to the abstract study of everything that makes up the constitution of the intellect and the soul, but he had little tact in concreting what he thus studied, with the complicating, every-day activities of the living soul of humanity.

When he gave himself to society, or to visitors, he was urbane and attractive, and in the language of civilities he approached to courtliness. It was not affectation, but a second nature, a product of long habit, in him to employ a sort of stilted language (the cause of which we will presently explain) altogether incongruous with the natural simplicity of his character. But, with his graceful and well-sustained agreeableness in company, this did not essentially mar the usually excellent effect of his address and bearing.

But it is time for us briefly to touch upon other characteristics which for a long period made him so respectably conspicuous before the public—on his standing as a preacher, thinker, theologian, and instructor.

Without being a learned man, in the proper sense of the term, he was remarkable for having the command of some of his powers to a degree rarely attained by our best educated men. By himself, with occasional aid, he had studied the

Latin and Greek and Hebrew languages. It cannot be supposed that his knowledge of these was as exact and comprehensive as under the training of conscientiously thorough masters, it more probably would have been; but the unbroken continuity of interest and purpose with which he pursued these and all his studies secured him a good discipline, and a marvelous power of concentration. He confined himself closely to one subject at a time, never laying it aside till he had gone at least once over the whole of it. Several classical works and the Hebrew Bible, for example, he read from beginning to end. He studied with a definite end in view. The effect of his classical reading was the adoption, in great part, of a new style of vocabulary. His concentrative tendency led him to compact forms of expression. To affect this, the words he chose were limited in number, but select and expressive. But an instructor's hand upon him was obviously wanting here, who would have insisted on the enlargement of his list, culled from Saxon, as well as from Latin sources; and who would have exhibited to him the varying shades of meaning in words of classic origin. Trammeled often by the meagerness of his list, he used the same words over and over, in painstaking discourses, in conversation often, and in unrevised manuscripts; each time, too, with a slightly shifting sense in those words, thus incurring the fault of inexactness of statement and consequent obscurity of meaning. To persons unused to his style, his language sometimes needed translation. But in his revised efforts this fault did not usually appear. It was seldom seen in his later sermons.

It was in the pulpit, we think, that he appeared before select audiences always to the best advantage. Of medium size in person, he stood before his audiences with an unpretentious, yet impressive presence. With countenance pale from feebleness, with attitudes firmly controlled, with gestures few and significant, with eye brilliant and speaking, with voice deep and penetrating, with utterance deliberate, and with sentences of easy length, he proceeded in few words from his text to its thesis, announced his course of discussion, then held intelligent hearers in breathless, some of them in rapt attention by the hour, chaining and overpowering them by compact and unfaltering argumentation. More or less, however, the style of his

thought in sermons was inevitably metaphysical, but more cautiously intruded, and more simply set forth than in class exercises and lectures, and to hearers having neither genius nor taste for this less interest of course was produced.

But herein was apparent the power he possessed, partly natural, but more the result of vigorous self-discipline for fifty years; the power of bending his intellect to whatever subject was before him with an intense concentration. When you thought his topic exhausted, or a special point already sharpened to the utmost, you were startled to see his critical skill applied in a still finer analysis of the subject in hand. Few persons excelled him in this power. And to analytic acuteness was added the ability to retain an unflagging tension of thought amid interruptions. His mind had its seasons of unbending, but the firm hold it took of its subjects of critical study was not permitted to be broken. His health compelled him steadily to take his hours of exercise with the ax, or the woodsaw, or the garden hoe; but omissions to his continuity of thought in his library, whether for exercise or for class lectures, never hindered him from easily taking up his line of thought just at the link of connection at which he had left it. This he could do with no required exertion to collect his energies, and put them at once, with fresh intensity and earnestness, at their accustomed power and speed of working. Such a complete command over the higher powers of intellect was in him the result of saving grace, early effecting a regeneration of his will, emotions, and passions, and giving to his will a right direction, and a momentum such as never abated to his latest breath. Not to the degree, perhaps, yet like to the manner of the prophet Elijah, or of John the Baptist, or of an anchorite of the third century, it made him *love* the discipline of self-imposed severity. This converted that which to others is work, hard, irksome work, into most entertaining play to him, and rendered him able, amid great battling with weakness and poor health, to spend his customary hours, from early morn to his rest-hour at night, for half a century, in educating himself to be a thinker.

A special charm seemed to settle upon many a subject of study that engaged him. The God of nature had given to him a mental eye to see things vividly; to see many things with an enduring glow upon them. The fact that he possessed a rare

and ready command of the comparative faculty we have before intimated. It was represented both in imagination and in discursive trains of thought. Imagination was a born gift to him, but it seldom appeared in the use of the simile. He used the form of thought in which the art of comparison was strongly *implied* only in the metaphor; and often this would not be recognized as such, being concealed in condensed expression. All the while the activities of his mind seemed stimulated by an accessory pictorial phase in which comparison and representation were both combined. It shed light before him in his path of thought, so that if ever his ideas were not clear, it was due not to any darkness that his mind traveled in, but to the artificial expression of them. His was what Sir W. Hamilton, citing Ancillon's *Essais Philosophiques*, would call the imagination of abstraction united with the imagination of feeling. The first glowingly exhibits certain phases of a single object, to the exclusion of other objects, not omitting the sign connecting those phases; the second represents the accessory images, kindred to some conception at the moment, giving it increasing compass, depth, and intensity.

As a consequence, his mind tended to run out long lines of thought, each to an ultimate analysis if possible rather than to comprehend and grapple with bodies or systems of thought in a single generalization. By this we do not mean that he never generalized the results of his analysis into system, but that it seemed more agreeable to him to elaborate the parts of system than to be employed on the synthesis of those parts. As warmly as Kant, more warmly than Leibnitz, he bestowed an untiring zeal upon the scheme of primitive cognitions, and he went "mousing around" all the labyrinths of mind in search of them. He drew from these cognitions his main weapons to ward off the force of a pressing argument against his positions. Whether or not he had settled their full character as primary truths—their absolute necessity and universality—is not the question now; but he used them abundantly in all his reasonings. They served him *chiefly* as elements for premises to every conclusion. Admit them, and his conclusions were, of course, decisive. Deny them, or suspect them, and you were asked to show that they were not ultimate truths by pointing out what decisive truth or principle was antecedent to them.

Few, if any, undertook to do this, because thought, in its last analysis, is not yet settled by philosophy as decisively possible in but comparatively few cases, at the most; and because, moreover, few persons, though questions of this character were all settled, would care to enter the lists with him, unless, like him, they were favored with a vivid and penetrative view of this high region of thought in its length and breadth, and so could trace all the course of thinking in which he dared to be so positive and emphatic. Cautious persons often hesitated to receive his dogmatic averments, not from want of profound respect for his metaphysical acuteness, but from fear lest his enthusiasm over the importance of some partial truth had swollen it to the proportions of a full truth.

Nor was he without caution, without even grave apprehensions, when he discovered that certain speculations which otherwise would have had a dazzling interest to him were drifting, as he thought, to the overthrow of theism. He drew his sword, hotly sharpened, not more upon the *tabula rasa* theory of Locke, which his ardent nature hated, as tending to materialistic atheism, than upon Hamilton's Philosophy of the Conditioned, involving a doctrine of causation and a notion of the inconceivability of the absolute and the infinite, both of which he considered as equivalent to an acknowledgment that there is no God. During the last two years of his life he waged against these speculations a relentless warfare, and was extremely sensitive at any body's seeming toleration of them. He rightly held that the moral feeling within us, as the bond of relation between us and God, is adequate to raise a reliable apprehension of God sufficient to warrant a positive belief in him; and this Hamilton admitted, denying only that the infinite God can, by finite man, be conceived, comprehended, or known as an object of thought. Dr. Dempster was strenuous in opposing Richard Watson's view of succession as a mode of God's existence in time, and rightly: for God does in himself exist out of all relation to time; yet this timeless mode of being, this manner of having all things in time present to him *eternally at once*, so to speak, is a thing absolutely impossible to conceive though doubtless true; and if one mode or attribute of God's being be thus, why should not all modes, all attributes? why should not God, in his essence, be likewise inconceivable?

He was also vigilant in maintaining the immediate agency of God in all the phenomena of nature. And he sometimes insisted on such anthropomorphic terms, expressive of God's agency in nature, that you felt as if you were, for the time, living in the old Hebrew atmosphere of thought, in which the Lord was heard to thunder in the heavens, and the Highest to give forth his voice, and was seen to send out his arrows and to shoot forth his lightnings. And when he added the usual metaphysical coloring to this sensuous view of God's acts in nature, there seemed but a shadow of difference between it and a system of physical pantheism, unless you eliminated from it—as was needful—the burning glow which his ardor had kindled in the subject. The inconveniences to an extreme advocacy of this view arise from inability to conceive or understand how an omnipotent act every moment applied immediately and directly to keep a thing in a made state, differs in degree or manner of application from the original omnipotent act to create that thing; and how, if there be no difference, an omnipotent sustaining act varies, in kind, degree, or manner, from an omnipotent creating act, so as to avoid the conclusion that to sustain nature every moment God must newly create nature every moment. And then, if God does thus newly create it, comes the metaphysical destruction of its identity with what it was ten or two moments ago. For repeating the constitution of a thing over and over does not make it, *per se*, the same thing this moment which it was in any past moment. Besides, "all souls are mine, saith the Lord." He has absolute proprietorship in mind as well as in matter, for he made and he sustains both. But let absolute identity of mind in its every successive moment be lost, so then will its responsibility also be null. We name inconveniences such as these to show that an extreme statement of even a proper doctrine is liable to the fallacy of proving too much by bringing into the case more than belongs to it.

To all the distinctive doctrines of the Church Dr. Dempster was strenuously loyal. They were to him the best statements of a conscientious interpretation of the Scriptures on the points to which they related. And he taught them, together with the whole evangelical scheme, with such a depth of living spiritual interest in them; with such an entering of his kindled intellect into their vital meaning, that as an instructor, often,

he contributed as well to the spiritual as to the intellectual growth of his students. His best thoughts would often flash out to the great interest and edification of his class when in familiar daily exercise with them. It was here that his greatness was most obvious to them. Long will his name be precious in their memories!

We are compelled by the limits of our space to pass lightly over many topics bearing on his career on which we should dwell with sincere, heartfelt interest. We wish we had space to give our full estimate of him as a hopeful, warm-hearted man of progress. He loved the right as he loved the truth, and his earnest moral feelings impelled him, so far as in him lay, to join irrevocably the true and the right in all efforts at reform, whether in the Church or in civil government. His voice was heard in solemn and eloquent appeal on this subject, both in the General Conference of the Church of his choice, and before the chief magistrate of the nation. His eye too was ever toward the ages before him. He went not back into the past save to draw thence some lessons from errors committed there, as a way-warning to shun mistakes along the line of the future, whither his intense yearnings were directed. He placed his hope of the future on the young and rising talent of the Church—on young men of two generations behind him, with whom his heart did so beat in sympathy, that to the last day of life he was a fine specimen of a *young* old man.

No doubt he heeded too little the warnings of his bodily decay, because his will was firm and elastic as ever, his hopes as bright, his mental powers as vigorous as in years agone; and the illusion of possibly a decade of years to come, despite his feebleness, temporary, as he hoped, may perhaps have flattered him into the hope of full time yet to revise his piles of manuscript material, and digest them into publications of permanent worth. His work of pioneering in Biblical Institutes must first be finished, then he was ready, as earnestly urged by friends, to put his critiques and monographs in such form and character that the world would not willingly let them die. His work, long contemplated, on the Will was not completed. It will go to the press in the form of lectures, as he delivered them; but the revisions and the chasms which his own hand should have supplied will be untouched; nevertheless they

will have great interest to the thousands of his friends and former pupils. His latest writings of public interest were a series of papers in a weekly journal, introductory to a course of essays on Natural Theology, which he also hoped to have full opportunity yet to finish.

The truth in his case was, that his intense and deep nature was ever fastening itself on plans of work yet to be executed. With great painstaking to preserve his habitually feeble health he had protracted his years far beyond what was once deemed a possible expectation, and he was doubtless fond of trusting that he might reasonably lay down his programme of mental work for many years longer. The reward, in this life, for half a century of self-denial and hard thinking, he did hope to enjoy; but he died on the threshold of his reward, *in* hope, but not in possession.

And we cannot repress the sorrow that comes every day unbidden for such a sudden disappearance from us of a nature so morally earnest, and of a mind so profoundly analytic and conceiving plans so broad and promising. But his work was done; and we honor his name. We honor him for creating such necessity, and inspiring such enthusiasm in minds around him to be earnest thinkers. We honor him, because, under the most stinted privilege, he was such a *marvel* of success in becoming himself, in given directions, the strongest of thinkers. We are sure that he lamented the one-sidedness of his education. We know that he deplored the disadvantage of having had no instructors; no liberalizing atmosphere of learned halls for the moulding and sustaining of his intellectual growth, none of the sobering attritions that occur in daily recitation drill, and in hourly fellowship with earnest colaborers in study. And we know too how consuming was his ardor to leave nothing undone on his part, to offer every needed privilege to the generations of the Christian ministry that are to follow. In this mission, as well as in all his work for his Master and the Church, his eye was single, he walked by faith, and he lived in humble, habitual prayer. He filled distinguished posts with fidelity and success. Nine times he was appointed to serve in the quadrennial councils of the Church. His name and work are a savor of life in Great Britain and in both Americas. He will go down to posterity with reputation and honor.

Art. II.—THE UNAUTHORIZED CALVINISM OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

The authorized English version of the Holy Bible is perhaps as faultless as any modern translation. It by no means follows, however, that it is a *perfect* representation of the original. It has been well said that "to err is human." Men investigate and understand according to the bias of their minds. The authors of the English translation were neither infallible nor free from prejudice. While the Oriental Churches, both Greek and Syriac, maintained the primitive doctrines held by the Church before Augustine brought in predestination and necessitated will, and even the Romish communion, while respecting the authority of Augustine, declined to accept his fatalism, Protestantism early and prevalently became infected with what is now termed Calvinism. It was thus the great theological misfortune of that age that in abolishing the abuses in the ritual and institutions of popery it departed from some of the original doctrines of Christianity and the general Church.

When Luther was opposing the corrupt doctrines and practices of the Romish Church, with its pompous and multiform ceremonies, its penances, confessions, absolutions, and priestly assumptions, he readily and naturally passed to the opposite extreme of denying the good of all human effort, and even of asserting that there is no freedom of the will. He was the more inclined to these views from the fact that the Augustinian order of monks to which he belonged, whose doctrines he had early imbibed, and whose writings and libraries had been his chief study, followed the predestinarian theories of Augustine. These views being thus grafted upon the Reformation, spread with its growth. Afterward Calvin gave them a permanent form, and established them with all that force which this position, learning, eloquence, and genius could so well give.

These doctrines became thus not only the most prominent, but, we might say, the prevalent views of the Reformation. The discussions concerning them were not so much with respect to their truth as to the manner in which we should understand them, whether as supralapsarian or sublapsarian. Though Arminius afterward arose and opposed them, yet his views

were condemned by the Synod of Dort, and Calvinism was publicly indorsed as alone orthodox. The errors of Pelagianism, which were propagated to some extent about this time, also did much to bring Arminianism into disrepute. The adherents of Calvin, blinded by their prejudices, either could not or would not see the difference between the teachings of the two systems, and a favorite method of confuting the latter was by imputing to them the errors of the former. Moreover, the philosophy of the age was all arrayed in favor of Calvinism, and whoever would aspire to the title of metaphysician must be a firm believer in the passiveness of man and the irresistibility of the laws of nature. Even at the present time our metaphysicians, in their doctrines on the human will, are not altogether free from the chimerical, foolish, and corrupt dogmas of the schoolmen. Subsequently to the time of James, under whom our translation of the Bible was made, Archbishop Laud endeavored to restore in England the primitive doctrines, which was one of the reasons of his execution by his Puritan opposers. A lax Arminianism prevailed in the English Church, but it was not until the Wesleys that the doctrines taught by Arminius himself were fully exemplified not only in their theory, but their practical spirit and power. Bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation in England, informs us (vol. ii, p. 180) that in that country the doctrines of predestination were not only the prevailing orthodoxy in the middle of the sixteenth century, but that some carried them so far as to "reckon that since everything was decreed, and the decrees of God could not be frustrated, therefore men were to leave themselves to be carried by these decrees. This drew some into great impiety of life, and others into desperation." The excesses of these men induced Luther to change his views, and Melanchthon to openly write against them. Under such influences and prejudices our translation was given to the world. It is no wonder, therefore, that there are in it so many unwarrantable expressions favoring Calvinism.

No one word of our Bible exhibits more strongly the rigid predestinarian views of the translators than their use of the word "ordain." Where the sacred writers speak of things as "made," "appointed," "disposed," "placed," etc., these men, thoroughly leavened with predestinarianism, conceive of them readily as ordained. This word is in twenty-one places of the New Test-

ament, and is used as the translation of no less than twelve different Greek words, namely, *γίγνομαι, to become*, Acts i, 22; *διατάσσω, to arrange, set in order, dispose, command*, 1 Cor. vii, 17; ix, 14; Gal. iii, 19; *κατασκενάζω, to prepare, provide*, Heb. ix, 6; *καθίστημι, to set up, appoint*, Heb. v, 1; viii, 3; Titus i, 5; *κρίνω, to judge, decide*, Acts xvi, 4; *ὁρίζω, to bound, determine, mark out*, Acts x, 42; xvii, 31; 1 Cor. ii, 7; *προγράφω, to write or describe before, to write in public*, Jude 4; *προετοιμάζω, to prepare before*, Eph. ii, 10; *ποιέω, to make, appoint*, Mark iii, 14; *τάσσω, to set in order, dispose*, Acts xiii, 48; Rom. xiii, 1; *τίθημι, to place, set, appoint*, John xv, 16; 1 Tim. ii, 7; *χειροτονέω, to elect by voting with the uplifted hand*, Acts xiv, 23; and once it is introduced without any corresponding word in the Greek, namely, Rom. vii, 10: "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Where is the necessity for thus inserting this word? It will be seen from the above list that *ordain*, as the translation of *ορίζω*, which is the only Greek word used by the inspired writers that can be said to correspond to it in the sense of determine, or destine, and which in its compound form, *προοριζω*, is the only word rendered in the Bible *predestinate*, (see Rom. viii, 29, 30; Eph. i, 5, 11,) is found only in three places, namely, Acts x, 42. Speaking of Christ, it is said that he "was *ordained* of God to be the Judge of quick and dead;" and again, (xvii, 31,) "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath *ordained;*" and lastly, in 1 Cor. ii, 7, where the apostle speaks of the wisdom of God, "even the hidden wisdom, which God *ordained* before the world unto our glory," where the context plainly shows that a comparison is made between the wisdom of the world and the plan of redemption as now revealed, that this was the plan God had determined from the beginning, though only now consummated.

In like manner we find this word occurs twenty times in the Old Testament, and it is used in those places as the translation of eleven different Hebrew words, namely, יָסַד, *to place, put, set*, 1 Chron. ix, 22; Psa. viii, 2; כּוּן, *to set up firmly, to create*, Psa. viii, 3; נָתַן, *to give*, 2 Kings xxiii, 5; Jer. i, 5; שִׂים, *to appoint*, Dan. ii, 24; עָמַד, *to stand, set up*, 2 Chron. xi, 15; עָרַךְ, *to set in order*, Psa. cxxxii, 17; Isa. xxx, 33; עָשָׂה, *to make*, Num. xxviii, 6; 1 Kings xii, 32, 33; פָּעַל, *to make, create, pre-*

pare, Psa. vii, 13; קוּם, *to rise up, to cause to stand*, Esth. ix, 27; שִׂים, *to put, set, place*, 1 Chron. xvii, 9; Psa. lxxxi, 5; Hab. i, 12; נָתַן, *to set, put*, with dative *to give*, Isa. xxvi, 12;* and twice, namely, 2 Chron. xxiii, 18; xxix, 27, it is arbitrarily inserted in italics. By what rules of interpretation can such a miscellaneous use of this word be accounted for? The common acceptation of most of the original words is very different from that of our "ordain," while no one of them is identical with it, unless it be the Greek *ορίζω*. Is there anything, then, in the context that requires this word to be used instead of the ordinary signification of the words so translated? If this were admitted, would it not argue a great lack of judgment in the inspired writers in the choice of words to express their meaning? If they meant ordain, why did they not use the word that would have conveyed their meaning clearly? Where such word was not used, it is fair to presume that such was not their meaning. Moreover, what passage of Scripture is there where ordain is used, the meaning of which would not be conveyed as well, yea better, by the ordinary English equivalent of the original word?

We have spoken of only one use of this word, namely, to destine or decree, because in those places in our version where the signification from the use of this word is seemingly to consecrate, or install into office, there is nothing in the original to indicate such act of consecration. The Hebrew expression corresponding to our ordain, with the meaning to consecrate to a particular office or duty, is מִלֵּא אֶת־יַד, *to fill the hand of any one*, which is rendered in the Septuagint Greek version by the equivalent phrases *πληροῦν τὴν χεῖρα*, *to fill the hand of any one*, Judges xvii, 5–12; 1 Kings xiii, 33; *τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας*, *to make perfect the hands of any one*, Exod. xxix, 9–35; Lev. viii, 33; Num. iii, 3; and once this verb is used alone, Lev. xxi, 10; *πλήσουσι χεῖρας αὐτῶν*, *they shall fill their hands*, Ezek. xliii, 26; and *ἐμπλήσεις αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας*, *thou shalt fill their hands*, Exod. xxviii, 41. This Hebrew phrase is uniformly rendered "to consecrate" in the English Bible, where the ordination of the priests and Levites is referred to. A part of this ceremony of consecration of the Levites,

* The corresponding words of the Septuagint are *ἀπαιτέω*, Isa. xxx, 33; *γίγνομαι*, Num. xxviii, 6; *δίδωμι*, Isa. xxvi, 12; 2 Kings xxiii, 5; *ἐξεργάζομαι*, Psa. vii, 13; *ἑτοιμάζω*, Psa. cxxxii, 17; *θεμελίοω*, Psa. viii, 3; *ἱστημι*, 1 Chron. ix, 22; Esth. ix, 27; *καταρτίζω*, Psa. viii, 2; *καθίστημι*, Dan. ii, 24; 2 Chron. xi, 15; *ποιέω*, 1 Kings xii, 32, 33; *τάσσω*, Hab. i, 12; *τίθημι*, 1 Chron. xvii, 9; Psa. lxxxi, 5; Jer. i, 5.

as described in Num. viii, 10, consisted in the laying on of the hands of those who assisted at such ceremonies. This part of the Jewish rites was retained by the apostles in the ordination of deacons and elders for the Christian Church, (Acts vi, 6; xiii, 3; 1 Tim. iv, 14; v, 22.) None of these expressions, however, are found in the Hebrew, the Septuagint, or the New Testament Greek; nor is there any word signifying to hallow, consecrate, or sanctify, in those places where ordain is used in the English Bible. While, therefore, it is possible that the translators designed to convey the idea of consecration in 2 Kings xxiii, 5; 1 Chron. ix, 22; 2 Chron. xi, 15; Jer. i, 5; Mark iii, 14; Acts i, 22; xiv, 23; 1 Tim. ii, 7, and Titus i, 5; yet, when we take into consideration the force of the corresponding words in the original Scriptures it is equally, and perhaps in most instances more probable, that they meant to use the word in its signification of destine. Such common use of this word indicates plainly the bias of mind and manner of thinking of the translators. The doctrines of foreordination and the eternal decrees had been so long and firmly believed that the character of the people had in a degree become moulded by them; and so familiar to their minds were the words used to express their views that even when speaking of human purposes and appointments, these words were the most fitting representative of their ideas, and their language naturally took the same form of expression. In view of the above facts, it will readily appear that but little confidence can be placed in this word as teaching the dogmas of Calvinism in those passages that are usually quoted in proof of those doctrines. We will now examine these more specifically.

We read in Acts xiii, 48: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed." The Greek word τεταγμένοι, here rendered *ordained*, is, in its primitive usage, a military term, having reference to the marshaling of troops; nor is there in it any semblance to the idea of foreordination. In no other place where it occurs in the New Testament is it rendered ordain, except in Rom. xiii, 1: "For the powers that be are ordained (τεταγμέναι) of God;" and there the marginal reading is "ordered." Wesley's paraphrase, which conveys the meaning more accurately, is, "Are subordinate to, or orderly disposed under God." If we seek for other instances of the New Testa-

ment usage of this word, we shall find nothing to justify the translation given in this passage. In Acts xv, 2 it is rendered "they determined;" in 1 Cor. xvi, 15, "they addicted themselves;" in Acts xx, 13 we learn that Paul went on foot to Assos, "for so he was disposed," (*διατεταγμένος ἦν.*) In the Septuagint it is of quite common use, both in its simple form and also as compounded with the preposition *παρὰ*, to denote the arrangement or disposition of troops for battle. (See 1 Mac. v, 27; 2 Mac. xv, 20; 2 Sam. x, 8, 9, 17; 1 Chron. xix, 17; 2 Chron. xiii, 3; xiv, 10, etc.) Benson, in his Commentary, speaking of the military use of this word, says: "It expresses or refers at once to the action of the commander marshaling them, and to their own presenting themselves in their proper places." So also Dr. Doddridge, as quoted by him, says: "This I take to be precisely its sense here, and have therefore chosen the word determined, as having an ambiguity something like that in the original. The meaning of the sacred penman seems to be that all who were deeply and seriously concerned about their eternal happiness (whether that concern began now or were of longer date) *openly* embraced the Gospel." Watson, Fletcher, Horne, and Dr. Whitby render this passage, "And as many as were disposed for eternal life believed." Dr. Heylin, Waterland, and others, as quoted by Benson, render it, "As many as were in a fit disposition for eternal life believed." Dr. Hammond renders it, "Fitly disposed and qualified for;" Dr. Wall, "Fit to receive."

The next example to which we invite attention is Jude 4: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation," *προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρῖμα.* The Greek word *προγεγραμμένοι*, here rendered "before ordained," is a perfect participle from *προγράφω*, and literally translated would be, *written* or *described before*. Wesley renders the passage, "Who were of old described before, with respect to this condemnation." Horne, in his "Introduction," mentions a judicial usage that throws much light on these words. He says, (vol. ii, p. 55,) "Those who were summoned before courts of judicature were said to be *προγεγραμμένοι εἰς κρισιν*, because they were cited by posting up their names in some public place; and to these judgment was published or declared in writing. The Greek writers applied the term *προ-*

γεγραμμενους to those whom the Romans called *proscriptos*, or *proscribed;* that is, whose names were posted up in writing in some public place, as persons doomed to die, with a reward offered to whoever would kill them." The evident and plain meaning of the inspired writer in this passage is not that God had foreordained certain men to be thus wicked, but that the very wickedness of which these men were guilty was of olden times described; namely, in the historical parts of the Scriptures; with the condemnation of those people who practiced such things. He then, in proof of this, proceeds to mention those to whom he refers, namely, the Israelites who, though delivered from Egypt, were yet slain in the wilderness; the angels which kept not their first estate; Sodom and Gomorrah: Cain and Korah; and the ungodly antediluvians to whom Enoch preached. So, he gives them to understand that if any now, who have once even known the grace of the Lord Jesus, should presume thereupon, and should make that grace a license to sin and to all manner of heretical belief, they may know that their previous knowledge of the way of life will not save them from the condemnation due to their sins. Where in all this is there anything like foreordination?

There is but one other place in the New Testament where "ordain" is used which is referred to in proof of the doctrine of predestination, namely, Eph. ii, 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." The word here translated "before ordained" is προητοίμασεν. As it is correctly rendered in the margin of our reference Bibles "before prepared," nothing more is necessary than to call attention to the fact that the marginal rendering is the correct one, and the only one that the word will bear.

The use of "foreordain," in those passages where it is found, is no more justifiable than is that of ordain. This word occurs twice: first, in Rom. iii, 25, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." In the marginal reading, there is "foreordained" in the place of "set forth." The original is προέθετο, which is correctly rendered "set forth" in the text. The second example is 1 Peter i, 20: speaking of our redemption through the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish, the apostle says, "Who verily was fore-

ordained before the foundation of the world," etc. The Greek is προεγνωσμένου, meaning simply *foreknown*. Both of these passages, it will be seen, refer to Christ; and though the *doctrine* thus taught may be true, yet in neither of them does the Greek justify the translation "foreordained."

We would next call attention to the word σὰρξ, and the adjective σαρκικος derived from it. The translation of these in some places by the theological term "carnal," has caused many to believe that there is a word in the original corresponding to this term, entirely different from the word rendered "flesh," and consequently, that where the latter word is used it is to be understood in its common acceptation; hence they are led to believe in the natural sinfulness of matter, and the impossibility of Christian perfection till freed from the body. Had these words been rendered without the intervention of this theological term to becloud the mind of the reader, their use would have been evident, one passage explaining another. Or, since a discrimination was made in part, if it had been carried on through the Scriptures, without the warping of a perverse theology, it might have saved the Christian world from much error. What an inconsistent mixing up of the words "carnal" and "flesh" do we find in Romans viii, 4–9: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, (κατὰ σάρκα,) but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα) do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς) is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς) is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh (ἐν σάρκὶ) cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, (ἐν σαρκὶ,) but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." Again, in the twelfth and thirteenth verses, "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, (τῇ σαρκὶ,) to live after the flesh, (κατὰ σάρκα.) For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify (put to death, θανατοῦτε) the deeds of the body, (πράξεις τοῦ σώματος or τῆς σαρκὸς,) ye shall live." What is the force of the expression "so then" in the eighth verse, unless ἐν σαρκὶ is here spoken of the carnal nature? Evidently κατὰ σάρκα is to be understood in the same manner.

Why should *φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς* be translated "carnal mind," and *τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς*, which has the same grammatical construction, be rendered "things of the flesh," instead of "carnal things?" So also *πράξεις τοῦ σώματος* or *τῆς σαρκὸς* should be "carnal deeds."

In Gal. v, 19–21, etc., is described the difference between the carnal and the spiritual man, as is evident from the works attributed to them: "Now the works of the flesh (*τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς*) are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." The expression *τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς* is of the same form as *φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς* of Rom. viii, 6, 7, or *δικαιώμασι σαρκὸς* of Heb. ix, 10; and if these latter ought to be rendered "carnal mind," "carnally minded," "carnal ordinances," with equal reason should this be "carnal works." For if we could say that some of the sins here mentioned were sins of the flesh, yet how could this be said of witchcraft, hatred, etc.? Is it true, moreover, that Christians, so long as they are in the flesh, are to expect to do such things as are here mentioned, and still retain their Christian character? Is it true that the body and the soul are in such antagonism that the one lusteth against the other, etc.? Does not our Saviour teach that it is the soul, and not the body, that is the source of sin?—Matt. xv, 19: "For out of the *heart* proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man." So also Jeremiah (xvii, 9) declares: "The *heart* is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Solomon says, Ecclesiastes ix, 3, "Also the *heart* of the sons of men is full of evil." And the apostle says, in the same verse in which he closes the enumeration of these works, "That they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." The entire scope of the chapter teaches that it is the carnal nature of which he is here speaking, and which he enjoins upon them to crucify with its lusts. Again, when Paul says, in Rom. vii, 18, "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, (*ἐν τῇ σαρκί,*) dwelleth no good thing," are we to suppose him as believing the heathen dogma, that matter is essentially corrupt and that the body is the source of all sin, or rather, that he is here speaking of the

carnal nature? How much more consistently with the doctrines of Christianity would it read, "For I know that in me, that is, carnally, dwelleth no good thing." Other examples might be cited, but these are sufficient to show the prevalence of Calvinistic views in the translation of this word.

In the rendering of the Greek ἐκλεκτὸς there is the same variableness and source of misapprehension. In many instances the theological term "elect" is used, while in other places it is otherwise rendered; thus conveying to the minds of many people that there is a Greek word of similar theological import to our "elect." With many, this word is the end of all controversy; because the Bible speaks of *the elect* it is good and sufficient proof to such that God did certainly elect and foreordain a certain and definite number, from eternity, to be saved in heaven, irrespective of any foreknowledge of their lives and characters. Had the Greek been uniformly rendered, this fallacy of many good people would have been avoided. This is a word of quite frequent use in the Greek Scriptures. Its common acceptation is chosen, fit to be chosen, choice, excellent, or approved; nor is there in it any such idea as the theological word "elect" conveys. It is entirely gratuitous, therefore, to say that because certain men are called ἐκλεκτοὶ therefore they are elected or predestinated to heaven. With equally good logic we might affirm that the authors of the Septuagint translation believed that "the seven fat kine," (τὰς ἑπτὰ βόας τὰς ἐκλεκτάς, *the seven elect cows*,) Gen. xli, 20, and "the seven rank (ἐκλεκτοὺς, *elect*) and full ears," Gen. xli, 7, which Pharaoh saw in his dream; or the "ten fat oxen," (μοσχοι ἐκλεκτοὶ, *elect oxen*,) and the "fat roebucks," (δορκάδων ἐκλεκτῶν, *elect roebucks*,) that were daily prepared for Solomon's table, 1 Kings iv, 23; or the "six choice sheep," (πρόβατα ἓξ ἐκλεκτὰ, *elect sheep*,) that were daily served at Nehemiah's table, Neh. v, 18, were thus predestinated to eternal life in heaven. We read in Judges xx, 16, "among all this people there were seven hundred chosen (בָּחוּר, ἐκλεκτοὶ, *elect*) men left-handed." Again, in Psa. lxxviii, 31, "The wrath of God came upon them, and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen (בְּחוּרֵי, ἐκλεκτοὺς, *elect*) men of Israel." In 1 Sam. x, 24, speaking of Saul, Samuel says, "See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen?" (בָּחַר, ἐκλέλεκται, *elected*.) (See also 2 Sam. xxi, 6.) If in these and like instances

the word "elect" had been used in our translation, none would have misconstrued it.

But why should one meaning be given to the word in these examples, and another in other parts of the Scriptures, when there is nothing in the context to require or justify such different and technical usage? Thus, in 2 John 1, did the apostle John certainly know that the lady to whom he wrote was elected according to God's eternal decree? If so, where have we the account of God's thus revealing the names of the elected? and how then could he consistently exhort her and her children, in verse 8, "Look to yourselves, that we lose not those things which we have wrought?" (*gained* in the margin.) When Paul, in writing to the Church at Thessalonica, says, (1 Thess. i, 4,) "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God," does he mean to teach them that the entire Church membership were certainly predestinated to Heaven? Yet he says, (2 Thess. iii, 6,) "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly;" and again, verse 11, "For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly." In the third chapter of this first epistle he speaks of the doubts he had been troubled with concerning them, and says, "I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labor be in vain;" but when he had heard from them by Timothy, he was comforted, and rejoiced for their sakes. (Verses 5, 7, 9.) He is not speaking here, then, of the certainty of their gaining heaven, but of their present approval by God, as manifest by their faith and good works. This passage would be better translated, therefore, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your approval by God." Among the various spiritual gifts mentioned in the Scriptures, we have no account of any gift of the foreknowledge of individual persons' future destiny. Instead of this, we find even Paul expressing a fear lest he himself should be a castaway. (1 Cor. ix, 27.)

What is there in the expression τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων (1 Tim. v, 21) to justify the translation "the elect angels" rather than the approved, or worthy, or excellent angels? If they were elected, to what were they elected? Does not the language of Jude 6 expressly imply that the holy angels are they who have kept their first estate? But if they were in the enjoy-

ment of "everlasting life" previously, how can it be said that they are "predestinated unto" it? When we remember that this is the only passage that the compilers of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith have advanced in proof of their doctrine, that "God, by an eternal and immutable decree, out of his mere love for the praise of his glorious grace, to be manifested in due time, hath elected some angels to glory," (Confession of Faith, chap. iii, sec. 3. Larger Catechism, Ques. 13 and 19,) we may readily see that there is nothing in the Scriptures that requires the Calvinistic rendering of the word as given in our version. We might in like manner cite every instance where the word elect occurs in the Bible, and we should find that not only is there no necessity for the use of this word in these instances, any more than in other places where the Greek is differently rendered, but also that the real meaning would be more truly and comprehensibly expressed by the use of some other word.

We read in Acts ii, 47: "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." As thus rendered the text sounds strongly Calvinistic; as though there were certain men whom the Lord had predetermined should be saved, and now he was daily adding such to the Church. But does the original justify such phraseology? The words τοὺς σωζομένους, which are rendered "such as should be saved," convey no idea of futurity; they are simply a present participle in the passive or middle voice and the definite article, and literally translated would be in the passive, "the saved," and in the middle voice, which from the context would seem to be the one designed by the writer, (see verse 40,) "those saving themselves." So far as the grammatical form of the participle is concerned there is no means for determining which voice it is in. Wesley renders it, "Those who were saved:" Bengel, "Those being saved." This same participle occurs in four other places of the New Testament, (Luke xiii, 23; 1 Cor. i, 18; 2 Cor. ii, 15; Rev. xxi, 24;) but in none of these have the translators given such a strained interpretation as in the text under consideration. Horne in his "Introduction," (vol. i, p. 423,) says of this passage: "We may remark" that it has "*no relation* whatever to the doctrine of election; that Luke is speaking as a historian of a fact which fell under his own

observation, relating to the Jews and not to the hidden counsels of God; and that if the translators of our authorized version had rendered the original literally, as they have done in other parts of the New Testament, it would have run thus: 'The Lord added daily to the Church the saved;' that is, those who were saved from their sins and prejudices; and so the passage is rendered by Drs. Whitby, Doddridge, and other eminent divines."

As 1 Peter ii, 8, now reads, it conveys to the minds of many people the impression that God has appointed certain men to disobedience; a meaning entirely foreign to the context. If it had been rendered, "The unbelieving stumble at the word," or "Even to them who being disobedient (*ἀπειθοῦντες*, *unbelieving*) stumble at the word, whereunto also they were appointed," the meaning of the sacred penman would have been much more evident. It is the stumbling because of their unbelief to which they were appointed. Dr. Adam Clarke gives in his Commentary the following as a translation, supported by many learned critics: "Also a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. The disobedient stumble against the word, (or doctrine,) to which verily they were appointed."

In 1 Sam. ii, 25, we read: "Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because the Lord would slay them." This rendering makes God the author of the wickedness done, and Eli's sons the passive medium through which God violates his own law, while they are at the same time the recipients of the divine wrath on account of the breaking of the law. It is true that כִּי does frequently mean "because," yet when we consider the wide range of signification which the Hebrew particles have, we can readily see that the passage will bear a much more consistent and God-honoring interpretation. Had it been rendered "by," "though," "so," or "therefore," no violence would have been done to the language, and the verse would have been consistent with the rest of the history, thus: "Notwithstanding they hearkened not to the voice of their father, therefore the Lord would slay them."

In the translation of verbs in the future tense there is similar evidence of Calvinistic perversions. The English language has two forms, "shall" and "will," by which to express the future, the Greek but one; by which one of these auxiliaries therefore we

should render a given word must be determined by the context and the general scope of the passage; yet all know how different the meaning as one or the other of these is used. "Will" indicates the subject of the verb as acting, and frequently in the second and third persons is simply predictive of the future; while "shall" in many cases has the force of an imperative, and frequently indicates that the real cause of the action lies, not so much in the subject of the verb, as in some power acting on that subject. How harshly imperative does John vi, 37, read: "All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me," presenting God's people as coming to Christ not so much because of their own desires and voluntary choice, as constrained and compelled by the irresistible decree. How much better would it read, All that the Father giveth to me will come to me. If, in 2 Tim. iii, 12, 13, "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse," the auxiliaries were changed, how different would the meaning be: Yea, and all that shall live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution. But evil men and seducers will wax worse. (See also Dan. xii, 10; 1 Kings xxii, 20; Acts xiii, 22; Matt. xxiv, 5–7, 9–12, 24; 1 Tim. iv, 1; 2 Tim. iii, 1, 2, etc.)

Words supplied in italics are another source of error. Psa. cx, 3, reads, "Thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power." This is a favorite text with Calvinists to show God's power over the will, and the auxiliary "shall" is spoken with violent emphasis, as though it were an end of all controversy. "Shall be" is, however, printed in italics, indicating that it is not found in the original; and the word נְדָבֹת, rendered "willing," is a noun, signifying in its usual acceptation "free-will offerings." (See Lev. xxii, 18, 21, 23; xxiii, 38; Num. xv, 3; Deut. xii, 6, 17; xvi, 10; xxiii, 23; Psa. cxix, 108; Ezra i, 4; iii, 5; vii, 16; viii, 28; 2 Chron. xxxi, 14," etc. Read it without the words supplied, "Thy people free-will offerings in the day of thy power." Is not the meaning evidently, Thy people offer, or will offer, free-will offerings, etc.; or, as Gesenius renders it in his Hebrew Lexicon, "Thy people are free-will offerings?" etc. But what is there to justify the Calvinistic rendering given in our Bible?

Again, Heb. x, 38: "Now the just shall live by faith: but

if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." In this text the words "*any man*" have been supplied, entirely perverting the sense by giving the verse a meaning which the translators may have wished, but which the original by no sophistry can be made to bear. It would properly read, The just shall live by faith, and if he draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him. On this text Dr. A. Clarke says: "The insertion of the words *any man*, if done to serve the purpose of a particular creed, is a wicked perversion of the words of God. They were evidently intended to turn away the relative from the antecedent, in order to save the doctrine of final and unconditional perseverance, which doctrine this text destroys."

Col. ii, 6, reads: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, *so* walk ye in him." By supplying the word *so* the text is made to mean simply that with what faith, self-consecration, etc., we first received Christ, *so* we ought now to walk; whereas it is an exhortation to perseverance, and should read: "As (or since) ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk ye in him."

The last passage that we have space to mention is Rom. ix, 11, 12: "(For the children being not yet born, neither having done anything good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth,) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." This text is regarded by many Calvinists as a perfect Gibraltar, invincible to all the assaults, and a complete refutation, of Arminianism; and if it were a correct transcript of the original it would certainly not be the weakest argument that is brought in defense of Calvinism. But the words "the children" are not in the original, nor are they the ones which the Scripture history teaches should be inserted. The reference is plainly not to the personal salvation of Jacob in heaven and damnation of Esau in hell, but the election of one to peculiar temporal privileges, and to the superiority of his descendants over those of the other. If the translators had taken the time and pains to refer to the place where these things were "said to her," they must have seen, unless blinded by their Calvinistic prejudices, that the prediction was not of the children personally, but of their descendants. The place is Gen. xxv, 23: "And the Lord said

unto her, Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger." Is it not, then, perfectly evident that the word "nations," or "people," should have been supplied here, and not children? Aside from this plain language, the history of Jacob and Esau teaches the same truth. Esau never did serve Jacob, nor was Jacob stronger than his brother; but the Edomites did serve the Israelites. (See 2 Sam. viii, 14; 1 Kings xi, 14–16; xxii, 47; 2 Kings xiv, 7; viii, 20–22; 1 Chron. xviii, 13; 2 Chron. xxi, 8, 10; xxv, 11, 12.) Even Dr. Scott, in his Commentary, though explaining this chapter according to Calvinistic views, yet admits: "It has often been urged that Jacob and Esau were not so much personally intended as their posterity, and that temporal and not eternal things are spoken of, and this is certainly true. Jacob never had dominion over Esau personally, but his posterity ruled over Esau's." Dr. Clarke says: "As the word children is not in the text, the word nations would be more proper, for it is of nations the apostle speaks." In view of these facts, to what can we attribute the unauthorized insertion of the word children but to the prepossessions of the age at the time the translation was made?

We here take leave of our subject, believing that the examples already adduced are amply sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind that our present authorized version of the Bible is the translation of men who were biased by Calvinistic prejudices. It might, without any great impropriety, be called the Calvinistic Translation. Notwithstanding this discouraging and opposing influence, Arminianism has made marvelous progress during the past hundred years. What might we not then expect if an impartial translation could be put into the hands of the people?

Art. III.—EDWARD LIVINGSTON.

Life of Edward Livingston. By Charles Havens Hunt. With an Introduction by George Bancroft. New York: Appleton & Co.

The lives of the distinguished brothers, Robert R. and Edward Livingston, intertwined as they were with the history of their country, ought before this to have been written. While Edward, nineteen years the younger, was a boy at school, Robert was playing a prominent part in the opening scenes of the American Revolution. He continued to be one of the leading spirits, as chairman of the committee that drafted the Constitution of the State of New York, as first Chancellor of the State, as the first Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and as Minister to France, where, by his skillful diplomacy, he obtained for the United States the rich province of Louisiana. At the same time he was perfecting his experiments in steam navigation, which his ability, perseverance, and large expenditure, aided by the practical suggestions of Fulton, gave to the world.

The life of the younger brother will be welcomed as an important addition to American biography. With the valuable material placed at his disposal, his biographer could scarcely fail to produce an interesting work; but he has succeeded in marshaling his facts in so clear a manner as to give a very vivid impression of a life singularly varied, and illumined by the broad lights of professional, judicial, and diplomatic eminence.

Edward Livingston was born at Clermont, Columbia County, New York, on the 26th of May, 1764. He was descended from an ancient family. One of the men of note in it was Sir Alexander Livingston, of Calander, who, on the death of James I. of Scotland, in 1737, was one of the regents of the kingdom during the ministry of James II. His son James became the first Lord Livingston. Alexander, the fifth lord, the ancestor of the New York Livingstons, was one of the two guardians of Mary, Queen of Scots; and his daughter, Mary Livingston, one of the four Marys maids of honor to the unfortunate Queen. His son, John Livingston, being slain at the battle of

Pinkiefield, in 1547, was succeeded by a son of Alexander, the first of three generations of ministers in the Scottish Church. The third of these ministers was John Livingston, a celebrated preacher, well-known in the annals of the kirk, by which he was appointed with another commissioner, and in conjunction with those commissioned by the Parliament, to proceed to Breda, to negotiate with Charles II. the terms of that king's admission to the throne of Scotland. He spent nine years in Rotterdam, being exiled for nonconformity. His son Robert, the founder of the Livingston family in the New World, here learned to speak the Dutch language, and on his emigration to America he went to Albany, then a village settled by the Dutch.

He bought large tracts of land from the Indians, comprising one hundred and sixty thousand acres, extending from the Hudson River to the Massachusetts line. The patent by which this land was incorporated into the manor of Livingston bears date 22d July, 1686. Thirteen thousand acres of this land were left by the first lord of the manor to his youngest son, Robert, (the grandfather of Edward Livingston,) who built a house at Clermont and always resided there. His only child, Robert R. Livingston, married Margaret, the only child of Col. Henry Beekman. They lived in the summer at Clermont, and in the winter in Queen-street, New York. A family of four sons and six daughters crowned this happy union. Edward Livingston speaks of "the harmony that united, and the gayety that inspired" them "under the auspices of that excellent mother who was never happy but when her children and her guests were so." His mother was a woman of stately presence, of deep piety, great benevolence, and remarkable intelligence. "Judge Livingston," says the biographer of his son Edward, "was a man worthy to transmit to his children the strong traits of their ancestors. He was a man of earnest piety, inflexible principle, genuine patriotism, and great gentleness of character."

Edward was the youngest, and the darling of the family. His eldest sister, Mrs. Montgomery, spoke of her love for him as "surpassing woman's love." The sweetness of temper so remarkable in his childhood continued with him, a priceless gift, throughout his long life. One solitary instance occurred

in the family history when one of his sisters complained of him to her mother, who at once said: "Go into the corner; I am sure you have been very naughty, or Edward would not have done so." Mrs. L., a niece of Edward Livingston, well remembers his mother saying that she had never seen him angry in her life; and his first wife, who was present, said that she could say the same thing.

When Edward was nine years of age his sister was married to Richard Montgomery, and his departure for his northern campaign made a deep impression on the boy of eleven, who has preserved the following touching reminiscence connected with it:

> It was just before General Montgomery left for Canada. We were only three in his room: he, my sister, and myself. He was sitting in a musing attitude, between his wife, who, sad and silent, seemed to be reading the future, and myself, whose childish admiration was divided between the glittering uniform and the martial bearing of him who wore it, when all of a sudden the silence was broken by Montgomery's deep voice repeating the following lines, as one who was in a dream:
>
> "'Tis a mad world, my masters:
> I once thought so, now I know it."
>
> The tone, the words, the circumstances, all overawed me, and I noiselessly retired. I have since reflected upon the bearing of this quotation, forcing itself, as it were, upon the young soldier at that moment. Perhaps he might have been contrasting the quiet and sweets of the life he held in his grasp with the tumults and perils of the camp, which he had resolved to seek without a glance at what he was leaving behind. These were the last words I heard from his lips, and I never saw him more.

These first shadows thrown over the boy's life deepened as the close of the year brought accumulated sorrow to the household at Clermont. In the short space of three weeks Edward lost his father, his Grandfather Beekman, and his brother-in-law, General Montgomery. The boy must have taken a heavy heart to his school in Albany. He was soon transferred to the care of his old friend and tutor, Dominie Doll, who had opened a school at Esopus, now Kingston. It was a remarkable proof of the sturdy good sense of the mother, that she should allow her petted boy to walk eighteen miles to his school on Monday morn-

ing and to return in the same way on Saturday. He always spoke of these weekly journeys with pleasure, ascribing to them that love of walking which contributed so much to his health and vigor throughout his life.

Another lesson learned at this time he used to refer to with great humor. Accustomed to the well-spread board at Clermont, he looked with dismay at the first dinner of pork and potatoes in the Esopus farm-house, where he had been sent to board. "I don't like pork; we never have it at home," was his answer when he was invited to partake of the frugal fare. "Very well, my little man," replied the host, "nobody obliges you to eat it." And so the little man had to content himself with a potato. The second dinner was a repetition of the first, but the boyish appetite was becoming urgent in its demands. "The third day fastidiousness succumbed to hunger, and a course of pork and potatoes, varied by nothing more refined, was entered upon and endured through the school term."

Esopus, then the third town in the colony, was honored by the deliberations of the first Convention of the Representatives of the State of New York, obliged to leave New York on account of the neighborhood of Lord Howe and his forces. Robert R. Livingston, the eldest brother of Edward, was a conspicuous member of this body, as well as of the "Secret Committee for facilitating the military operations on the Hudson," in which capacity he was the guest and the trusted adviser of Washington. His important labors in these two bodies prevented his affixing his name to the Declaration of Independence, though he had been selected by Congress, at the age of twenty-nine, to serve with Jefferson, Franklin, Sherman, and Adams in its preparation. The governor, legislature, and citizens were soon dislodged from Esopus by the approach of the British, who set fire to the town. Robert R. Livingston gave five thousand acres of land for the relief of the inhabitants of Kingston, whose homes were thus made desolate.

Edward returned to Clermont, but not to a tranquil home. Preparations were being made for leaving the house before the arrival of Vaughan and his command, who were lighting their way by the flames of towns and private dwellings. The boy was seeing something of war as the family, rudely driven from their burning home, found refuge in the town of Salisbury.

Pilgrimages have since been made to the stone house which sheltered them. There they remained nearly a year, when the retreat of the British having enabled Mrs. Livingston to rebuild the house, they were once more at home at Clermont.

Tumultuous as the times were, the young Edward was fitting himself for college. In 1779 he was entered a junior at Nassau Hall, Princeton. Dr. Witherspoon had just returned to call together the students, renew the library, and to restore the college buildings, which had been occupied by a detachment of the army of Cornwallis. After two years spent in Princeton, young Livingston was graduated, at the age of seventeen, with but five fellow-graduates.

On leaving college Edward Livingston began the study of the law in Albany, in the office of John Lansing, afterward second Chancellor of the State. After the evacuation of New York by the British, in 1783, he returned to the winter residence of the family, and continued his studies there until January, 1785, when he was admitted to practice as an attorney. The bar of the city then numbered but forty members, among whom were Robert Troup, Egbert Benson, Brockholst Livingston, Melancthon Smith, Aaron Burr, and Alexander Hamilton, to whom in a few years were added Josiah Ogden Hoffman and James Kent.

Edward Livingston arrived at eminence in his profession without the severe struggle with poverty and obscurity so usual in the history of great lawyers. He had large and influential family connections, and a home and an office in his mother's house, 51 Queen-street, part of the present Pearl, near Wall-street. Here he met the most brilliant society, the leading members of the New York bar, and foreigners of distinction, especially French gentlemen, welcomed as the friends and fellow-countrymen of Lafayette, and made at home in a family all of whom spoke their language fluently. The supper-table was always surrounded by guests, and earnest discussions of politics and literature were relieved by the lighter play of repartee and the most genial merriment.

The attractions of society were not permitted to interfere with the intense application necessary to success at the bar, and Edward Livingston, stimulated by the expectations his family had formed in regard to him, devoted himself to the

study of Roman law, while he did not neglect general literature and the Greek and Latin classics.

On the 10th of April, 1788, he married Mary, the daughter of Charles M'Evers, Esq., a tall, fine-looking woman of high principle and strong good sense.

In December, 1794, Edward Livingston was elected a member of the Fourth Congress of the United States, and as he was re-elected to the Congresses of 1796 and 1798, he was six years in the House.

In February, 1796, the young member introduced a measure which showed the bent of his mind toward the active philanthropy which so distinguished his subsequent career. It was a measure for the protection of American seamen who had been extensively impressed in the foreign and especially in the British service.

He spoke on the last day of the second session in support of a resolution requesting the President to interfere in behalf of Lafayette, then a prisoner at Olmutz. The remembrance of the noble friend of his boyhood gave eloquence and enthusiasm to the speech of the man; but the resolution was lost, and Washington's private entreaties failed to unlock the Austrian prison, whose doors were opened to the military arguments of Napoleon.

In the second session Mr. Livingston distinguished himself by his opposition to the alien and sedition laws, and produced a profound impression on the popular mind of the nation. Of this he had, years after, an amusing illustration. On one of his daily walks on the levee in New Orleans he was accosted by a man in a rustic dress, who asked him if he was Mr. Livingston, and then said: "I have come to ask you to lend me a doubloon." On being asked why he wanted that precise sum, he replied, "that less would not serve his purpose, and more he did not need." On receiving the coin he put it into his pocket, saying, "Good-night. If I live you shall hear from me again." Two years passed, and the circumstance was forgotten. Mr. Livingston was one morning sitting at breakfast with his family when a stranger was announced, who, walking straight up to the table, placed upon it a shining doubloon, saying: "I see you do not recognize me. I am the man you saved from ruin by lending me this amount two years ago. I owned a flat-

boat; it had been sunk with all its contents, and I was left penniless. I knew no one here, and had no means of getting back to Kentucky. I calculated that it would take just that amount to carry me home. Had I not been ill you would have seen me last year. But I am here now, and every thing has prospered with me since we met." On being asked what had led him to seek help from Mr. Livingston, he replied, "I cannot tell exactly, only I came from Livingston County, in Kentucky, which was named in honor of the author of the speech on the alien bill, and having had you pointed out to me as the same man, I thought I had more claim on you than on any body else."

Some resolutions which Mr. Livingston offered in the third Congress, with regard to the penal laws of the United States, show that the great subject which he elaborated in his famous code had already occupied his attention.

Edward Livingston's years had hitherto been passed in the sunshine of worldly prosperity. His middle life was clouded with perplexity and affliction. In 1800 his mother was suddenly taken away, and the next year his wife died of scarlet fever. He made the following record in his Bible:

> On the 13th of March, 1801, it pleased Heaven to dissolve our union, which, for thirteen years, it had blessed with its own harmony, with an uninterrupted felicity rarely to be met with. Formed by mutual inclination in the spring of life, it was cemented by mutual esteem in its progress, and was terminated by a stroke, as sudden as it was afflictive.

While suffering the first anguish of this bereavement, he was appointed by Mr. Jefferson attorney of the United States for the district of New York, an honorable and lucrative office. About the same time he was appointed mayor by the council in Albany, then a post of great dignity and importance. The mayor in that day was required to give to the entertainment of strangers of distinction a degree of attention that became impossible in the subsequent rapid growth of the city. Mr. Livingston was eminently fitted to perform gracefully the duties of hospitality, and he kept open house at his residence, No. 1 Broadway, overlooking the Battery, now adorned with large trees planted under his direction. Amid multiplied duties, Mr. Livingston found time to set forth views in which

may be discovered the germ of the great scheme of philanthropy which was to make his name illustrious. At that early day he saw the necessity of those plans of discipline, reform, and active benevolence which have since found expansion in so many varied forms.

In a communication to the Mechanics' Society, he proposed that an organized attempt should be made by the society, jointly with the city government to found an establishment in which to assure the employment of first, strangers during the first month after their arrival; secondly, citizens who, from the effects of sickness or casualty, have lost their usual employment; thirdly, widows and orphans incapable of labor; and fourthly, discharged or pardoned convicts from the state-prison. This experiment would have required a capital and an organization which he thought the city government not prepared to undertake alone, but which he believed practicable as a joint undertaking of the government and the society which he addressed.

The mayor unfolded his scheme, of which the leading features were the opening of public workshops for the several branches of mechanical art, in which any tradesman wanting employment would be sure to get it in his proper trade, each shop to be managed under the direction of a committee appointed by the Mechanics' Society; a general office for the reception of applications by those destitute of employment as well as those requiring workmen; a large work-room, annexed to the almshouse, in which women and children might be employed in labors suited to their strength, where food might be prepared for them at a cheap rate, and where the children might receive the advantages of some education in the school belonging to the establishment; a system of regulations for the purchase of raw material, sale of manufactured goods, and price of labor, and the furnishing of the necessary capital by the corporation of the city.

The mayor's plans were in advance of the times, and the response of the society was a refusal to entertain them.

His claim as a philanthropist rests on better grounds than schemes, wise and far-reaching though they might be. On the 20th of July, 1803, the yellow fever made its appearance, and desolated the city with its fearful ravages. All who could leave fled from the pestilence. His biographer says:

The mayor calmly remained at his post, not limiting his exertions to the frigid performance of his official duty. On the contrary, he kept a list of the houses in which there were any sick, and visited them all, as well as the hospitals every day, ascertaining and supplying the indispensable needs of the poorest and most forsaken of the sufferers. He made every sick person in some sense his patient, and sought some share in the grief or joy of the families of victims or convalescents. He animated the zeal of his colleagues and subordinates in the government, stimulated the fidelity of nurses, physicians, and priests, and even went about the city at night to see for himself if the watchmen were thorough in their labors. In a word, it was the part of a Howard, in the person of a conscientious chief magistrate, that he enacted in this dreadfully real drama.

The fever began to abate before this true philanthropist was stricken with the contagion. The most enthusiastic popular regard was manifested. The choicest wines were sent when it was discovered that the last drop in his cellar had been given to the sufferers. His youngest sister watched him with the tenderest care, and his good constitution and sanguine will triumphed over the disease. Mr. Bancroft, in the graceful introduction to this interesting biography, writes:

Simple and frugal in his personal habits, he yet was overtaken by the severest calamity in his fortunes. Struck down by the yellow fever, caught from his visits of consolation and mercy to the sufferers among the poor during the raging of that disease in New York, he recovered from a desperate illness to find that he had been defrauded by a clerk, and that he was a debtor to the government beyond his means of immediate payment. Without a word of complaint, crimination, or excuse, he at once devoted his inheritance, his acquisitions, the fruits of his professional industry, to the discharge of his obligation to the government, and for near a score of years gave himself no rest till he had paid it, principal and interest without defalcation.

This sudden change in his fortunes shaped the subsequent career of Edward Livingston. He at once resigned both of his offices, arranged his affairs, conveyed all his property to a trustee for sale to cover his debt to the government, and leaving his children, from whom he had never been separated, to his brother, John R. Livingston, who had married Eliza McEvers, the sister of their mother, he embarked for New Orleans, with a hundred dollars in gold, and a letter of credit for a thousand dollars more. Louisiana, "the mother of states," recently secured to the United States by the efforts of his

brother, seemed to offer to Edward Livingston the opportunity of retrieving his fortunes more speedily than at home. He received gratifying letters from Governor Clinton, a political opponent, and from the Common Council expressing their sympathy, their appreciation of his valuable services, and their wish that he should retain his office of mayor. Mr. Livingston was much gratified by a mark of esteem given him in after years by some of his fellow-citizens of New York. They made him an honorary member of the Society of Cincinnati, Andrew Jackson being the only other person on whom this honor was conferred.

Ready money was not plenty in New Orleans, but liberal payments in land rewarded the services of an advocate. His biographer says:

> One of the earliest of these acquisitions was a property on the shore of the Mississippi, adjacent to the city, called the Batture S^te^ Marie, which alone—but for an unlooked-for and most untoward, as well as unjust and illegal opposition which he was destined to meet at the hands of his former friend, (Jefferson,) the President of the United States, whose election, when trembling in the balance, his vote and steady conduct had helped to decide, an opposition yielded in aid of local jealousy and temporary prejudice—would have made real, at an early day, his dream of independence.

After weary years this question was decided in his favor. Chancellor Kent wrote to him in 1814:

> Permit me to assure you that I have sympathized with you throughout the whole of this controversy, as I took a very early impression that you was cruelly and shamefully persecuted, and that too by the executive authority of the United States. . . . When your reply came I read it eagerly and studied it thoroughly, with a re-examination of Jefferson as I went along; and I should now be as willing to subscribe my name to the validity of your title, and to the atrocious injustice you have received, as to any opinion contained in Johnson's Reports.

Mr. Livingston's temper proved itself perfect throughout this long controversy, and though keenly alive to the injustice which he received, no word of unkindness in private ever passed his lips.

On the 3d of June, 1805, Edward Livingston married Madame Louise Moreau de Lassy, the young and beautiful widow of a gentleman from Jamaica. Her history had been an event-

ful one. Her more immediate ancestors had emigrated from France to St. Domingo, where they lived in affluence till the revolution in that island. Mrs. Livingston sometimes in vivid narrative described the horrors of the night in which her father, two brothers, and her aged grandmother perished, and the narrow escape from massacre of her mother, her brother Auguste, afterward Major Davezac, her infant sister, afterward Mrs. Carlton, and herself, a widow of seventeen. They reached the United States by different vessels, and were afterward reunited at New Orleans. Mrs. Livingston combined with remarkable beauty great brilliancy and force of character. A daughter blessed Mr. Livingston's home in New Orleans, but he keenly felt the separation from his children at the north. Julia, who in beauty, grace, intelligence, accomplishments, and loveliness of character was all that the fondest father could desire, was growing into womanhood at two thousand miles distance. There was a delicacy of constitution which awakened his solicitude, and in the summer of 1813 his alarm. He left New Orleans the first opportunity, and after a long and tedious passage arrived in New York in October. The father, oppressed by anxiety, hastened to the house of his brother in Greenwich-street, and after hurriedly inquiring after the family from the servant who opened the door, asked, "How is Miss Livingston?" The servant, who did not know him, replied, "She was buried, sir, yesterday." The shock was a terrible one. The tender father staggered under the blow so peculiarly afflictive, and long retained the visible marks of this great sorrow.

A remarkable episode in the life of Mr. Livingston is the prominent part he took in General Jackson's celebrated campaign at New Orleans. Perceiving the danger afar off, he took active steps to arouse the people, delivered an eloquent speech at a meeting of citizens, and was appointed chairman of a committee of defense. In behalf of this committee he drew up an address to the people of the state, and corresponded with General Jackson, then at Mobile, furnishing him with maps and information. General Jackson's address, on his arrival at New Orleans, fell coldly on the ears of the citizens, many of whom did not understand English. Mr. Livingston rendered it into French, and it produced an electric effect.

On Sunday, the 18th of December, there was a most impos-

ing pageant in the public square, General Jackson reviewing all the troops in the city in the presence of the whole population. At its close, Mr. Livingston, standing near the commanding general, read, in tones that reached the hearts of the assembled multitude, an address that aroused the deepest enthusiasm, and was pronounced a masterpiece of eloquence.

When the fighting began Mr. Livingston served as volunteer aid, and his bravery in the night-battle was especially commended by Jackson.

The address, in the handwriting of Mr. Livingston, read by Jackson's orders to the army of defense, describes the stirring incidents of the campaign, and thus sums up its results:

> And this glorious day terminated with the loss to the enemy of their Commander-in-chief, and one major-general killed, another major-general wounded, the most experienced and bravest of their officers, and more than three thousand men killed, wounded, and missing, while our ranks, my friends, were thinned only by the loss of six of our brave companions killed, and seven disabled by wounds. Wonderful interposition of Heaven! Unexampled event in the history of war! Let us be grateful to the God of battles, who has directed the arrows of indignation against our invaders, while he covered with his protecting shield the brave defenders of their country.

General Jackson, before leaving New Orleans, gave Mr. Livingston his miniature, painted on ivory, "as a mark of the sense" he entertained "of his public services, and a token of private friendship and esteem."

A most interesting chapter in the biography is devoted to Lewis Livingston, the beloved and only son of Edward Livingston. "From childhood's promising estate up to performing manhood," the fond father watched his progress, satisfied with the beautiful unfolding of so delicate and rich a nature, and most carefully suggesting the means of obtaining a ripe culture. In the campaign at New Orleans the youth, not then seventeen, was appointed assistant engineer with the rank of captain, and was commended by General Jackson "for talent and bravery." In the summer of 1818 he was commissioned by Governor De Witt Clinton to proceed to Quebec to superintend the removal of the remains of General Montgomery to New York, "a commission which he executed with perfect address and judgment."

At the end of this year, after a separation of three years and a half, Lewis rejoined his father in New Orleans. The joy of this meeting was soon clouded by an adverse decision given in the Batture case. "The dignified composure," writes Lewis to his aunt, "with which he listened to the judgment which blasted all his hopes, and stripped him of the fruits of fourteen years of hard and painful labor, drew tears from the eyes of all his friends, and struck with awe his bitterest enemies, even those who were instrumental in his ruin."

When Mr. Livingston returned from the court on that disastrous day he cut short the family comments on the subject by saying, "Come, let us say no more about it, and let us have the dinner served." During the dinner he was cheerful as usual, and afterward, taking his little daughter by the hand, he took his evening walk of an hour on the levee, talking to her about her lessons and upon other subjects that would interest her.

In 1820 Mr. Livingston accepted a seat in the Louisiana Legislature. In 1821, being anxious about his son's health, a voyage to France was resolved upon, and the young man sailed in April. He was warmly received by his father's friend, the Marquis de Marbois, and by Lafayette, and he wrote graceful letters to his father on the objects that engaged his attention. Foreign travel and medical advice, however, failed to restore his health, and in the autumn he wrote to his father that he had determined to return home. The letter reached the anxious father a few days before the arrival of the ship in which the son had embarked from Marseilles. Days of agonizing suspense, only to be ended by a terrible certainty! In the middle of January, 1822, the vessel arrived, and the father hastened to embrace his son, when he learned that he had died of a rapid consumption, and had been, the day after Christmas, buried by strangers' hands at sea. Thus rudely were broken the tender bands that had united father and daughter—father and son. In neither case was granted to him the melancholy satisfaction of parting words, or of seeing the beloved remains conveyed to their last resting-place. Years passed before Mr Livingston could open the youth's writing-desk, and his name never afterward passed the father's lips.

Mr. Livingston always found occupation the best remedy for

distress of every kind, and it was well that at this time he was intensely occupied with the great work of his life, that which was to place his name with the philosophers and reformers of the world. In February, 1821, he was elected, by joint ballot of the General Assembly of Louisiana, to revise the entire system of criminal law of the state. To this task he addressed all his energies, eminently fitted as he was by his profound knowledge of Roman, English, French, and Spanish law, and of the languages in which they are written, by his judicial and professional experience, his varied culture, his knowledge of character, and especially of the people for whom the laws were designed. While he was earnestly engaged in the prosecution of his work he was elected representative from the first district of Louisiana to the Eighteenth Congress. When he left for Washington his task was nearly done, and during the first recess of Congress he devoted himself to its completion. It was at 66 Broadway, where he had taken lodgings with his family. His great work was done, the final corrections made, a fair copy had been prepared for the printer, and Mr. Livingston had spent the evening in comparing the papers, when an accident occurred which, in the sublime patience with which it was borne, may well be put by the side of Sir Isaac Newton's equanimity when his manuscripts too had been destroyed, and when he only said to his dog, the cause of their destruction, "Diamond, Diamond, thou little knowest the mischief thou hast done." Mr. Livingston tells the story in a letter to M. Du Ponceau, from whom he had borrowed a volume of Bacon's works:

> The night before last I wrote you an apologetic letter, accounting for not having before that time thanked you for your letter and your book. My excuse lay before me in four codes of "Crimes and Punishments," of "Criminal Procedure," of "Prison Discipline," and of "Evidence." This was about one o'clock. I retired to rest, and in about three hours was waked by the cry of fire. It had broken out in my writing-room, and before it was discovered not a vestige of my work remained, except about fifty or sixty pages which were at the printer's, and a few very imperfect notes in another place. You may imagine, for you are an author, my dismay on perceiving the evidence of this calamity, for circumstanced as I am, it is a real one. My habits for some years past, however, have fortunately inured me to labor, and my whole life to disappointment and distress. I therefore bear it with more fortitude than I otherwise should, and instead of repining, work all

night, and correct the proof all day, to repair the loss and get the work ready by the time I had promised to the legislature.

This disaster did not disturb the calm serenity of Mr. Livingston's manner, and the night after he sat up until three o'clock in order to keep pace with the printer.

In two years more the code was completed, and, though the State of Louisiana never fully adopted it, its publication gave him a world-wide fame. Victor Hugo, the constant enemy of capital punishment, wrote to him: "You will be numbered among the men of this age who have deserved most and best of mankind." Villemain declared that this proposed system of penal law was "a work without example from the hand of any one man." Jeremy Bentham proposed that a measure should be introduced in Parliament to print the whole work for the use of the English nation. Taillander wrote: "The moment approaches when the Legislature of Louisiana will discuss the proposed codes prepared with so much care by Mr. Livingston. We hope that his principles will be adopted, and that state endowed with the noblest body of penal laws which any nation has hitherto possessed." Mr. Livingston received autograph letters on the subject from the Emperor of Russia and the King of Sweden, and a gold medal from the King of the Netherlands; while the government of Guatemala translated one of his codes, that of "Reform and Prison Discipline," and adopted it word for word, conferring, at the same time, the name of Livingston on a new city and district.

The leading features of this code were the total abolition of the penalty of death, and the proposal to enlarge the scope of penal legislation so as to embrace measures that would tend to preclude its commission. To this end the working of the system comprehended a house of detention, a penitentiary, a house of refuge and industry, and a school of reform, all under the superintendence and conduct of the board of inspectors. Mr. Livingston wrote beautiful letters to Sir Walter Scott, Fenimore Cooper, and Victor Hugo, endeavoring to gain the aid of their pens in reaching the popular mind, and influencing the public sentiment on the abolition of capital punishment. He also addressed most of the crowned heads of Europe on the subject.

After the lapse of nearly a quarter of a century Mr. Livingston was once more restored to the councils of the nation, and for six years kept his seat in the House of Representatives. He had been a member but four days when he introduced and succeeded in carrying into effect an important measure for the erection of light-houses, beacons, buoys, and floating lights along the track of navigation between New York and New Orleans; and he procured the erection of new and important Federal buildings at the latter place. At the same time he took a lively interest in public improvements, such as the great national road, and the project of a ship canal through the Isthmus of Panama to unite the two oceans.

Mr. Livingston became a senator of the United States from Louisiana on the same day that General Jackson entered on the presidency. His most elaborate speech was delivered on the 13th day of March, 1830, upon Foot's resolution raising the question of the true policy of the government with respect to the public lands, and embodied his views of the Constitution and the theory of the Federal Government. The following fine passage occurs in the conclusion of the speech, referring to the interior marble columns of the House, composed of variegated pebbles united by a natural calcareous cement:

> What were they originally? Worthless heaps of unconnected sand and pebbles, washed apart by every wave, blown asunder by every wind. What are they now? Bound together by an indissoluble cement of nature, fashioned by the hand of skill, they are changed into lofty columns, the component parts and the support of a noble edifice, symbols of the union and strength on which alone our government can rest, solid within, polished without. Standing firm only by the rectitude of their position, they are emblems of what senators of the United States should be, and teach us that the slightest obliquity of position would prostrate the structure, and draw, with their own fall, that of all they support or protect in one mighty ruin.

General Jackson offered him the position of Minister to France, but he declined it, and Mr. Rives, of Virginia, was sent.

In March, 1831, Mr. Livingston retired to Montgomery Place, a beautiful estate on the banks of the Hudson, left to him by his sister, Mrs. Montgomery, who died in 1828. Here he expected soon to be joined by his wife and daughter, and in

their congenial society to spend the summer amid the trees and shrubs of Montgomery. At the age of sixty-eight he seemed to have earned by the intense labors of a long life a right to a season of repose. But a sudden summons to public life broke in upon this pleasing dream, and on the 24th of May he entered upon the important duties of Secretary of State. After he had been a month in the office he wrote a letter to his wife which he asked her to destroy:

Here I am in the second place in the United States—some say the first; in the place filled by Jefferson and Madison and Monroe, and by him who filled it before any of them, my brother; in the place gained by Clay at so great a sacrifice; in the very easy-chair of Adams; in the office which every politician looks to as the last step but one in the ladder of his ambition; in the very cell where the great magician, they say, brewed his spells. Here I am without an effort, uncontrolled by any engagements, unfettered by any promise to party or to man; here I am! and here I have been for a month. I now know what it is; am I happier than I was? The question is not easily answered. Had the bait never been thrown in my way; had I been suffered to finish the graft I had begun when your letter summoned me from the country; had I been permitted to stay and watch its growth until the fall, to wander all the summer through the walks you had planned, to see my daughter improving in health and spirits, now and then to plan a picnic, or plague myself in the vain attempt to catch a trout; to have exclaimed, on hearing what had happened here, "Among them be it," and taken the opinion of my two heads of department, Shoemaker on the crop of wheat, and Owen on the celery bed; could I have passed my summer thus, and taken my independent seat in the Senate during the winter, I could then have answered the question readily. But the temptation was thrown in my way; the prize for which so many were contending was offered to me; the acceptance of it was urged upon me: if I had rejected it, I think it would have been a source of regret that would have made me undervalue the real enjoyments for which I refused it—such is human nature.

Many of his state papers are models of style and of political wisdom. The able pen that had so faithfully served General Jackson performed for him perhaps its greatest service in the preparation of the celebrated Proclamation of the 10th of December, 1832, to the nullifiers of South Carolina. The original draught of this famous state paper still exists, "entirely in Livingston's handwriting, much amended by erasures and interlineations, according to his invariable habit, in all but his

epistolary communications." How descriptive of the madness of the present hour are his eloquent words, and how thrilling his appeal to those who thirty years ago stood on the brink of the precipice down which their successors have blindly plunged! His words were:

Contemplate the condition of that country of which you still form an important part. Consider its government, uniting in one bond of common interest and general protection so many different states, giving to all their inhabitants the proud title of American citizens, protecting their commerce, securing their literature and their arts, facilitating their intercommunication, defending their frontiers, and making their names respected in the remotest part of the earth. Consider the extent of its territory; its increasing and happy population; its advance in arts which render life agreeable; and the science which elevates the mind! See education spreading the lights of religion, morality, and general information into every cottage in the wide extent of our territories and states! Behold it as the asylum where the wretched and the oppressed find a refuge and support! WE TOO ARE CITIZENS OF AMERICA! Carolina is one of these proud states; her arms have defended, her best blood has cemented the happy Union! And then add, if you can, without horror and remorse, This happy Union we will dissolve; this picture of peace and prosperity we will deface; this free intercourse we will interrupt; those fertile fields we will deluge with blood; the protection of that glorious flag we renounce; the very name of Americans we discard. And for what, mistaken men—for what do you throw away these inestimable blessings? For what would you exchange your share in the advantages and honor of the Union? For the dream of separate independence—a dream interrupted by bloody conflicts with your neighbors, and a vile dependence on a foreign power. If your leaders could succeed in establishing a separation, what would be your situation? Are you united at home? are you free from the apprehension of civil discord, with all its fearful consequences? Do our neighboring republics, every day suffering some new revolution, or contending with some new insurrection—do they excite your envy? But the dictates of a high duty oblige me solemnly to announce that you cannot succeed. The laws of the United States must be executed. I have no discretionary power on the subject my duty is emphatically pronounced in the Constitution. Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution deceived you; they could not have been deceived themselves. They know that a forcible opposition could alone prevent the execution of the laws; and they know that such opposition must be repelled. Their object is disunion; but be not deceived by names; disunion by armed force is TREASON. Are you really ready to incur its guilt? If you are, on the heads of the instigators of the act be the dreadful consequences, on their heads be the dishonor,

but on yours may fall the punishment. On your unhappy state will inevitably fall all the evils of the conflict you force upon the government of your country. It cannot accede to the mad project of disunion, of which you would be the first victims; its first magistrate cannot, if he would, avoid the performance of his duty. The consequence must be fearful for you, distressing to your fellow-citizens here, and to the friends of good government throughout the world. Its enemies have beheld our prosperity with a vexation they could not conceal; it was a standing refutation of their slavish doctrines, and they will point to our discord with the triumph of malignant joy. It is yet in your power to disappoint them. There is yet time to show that the descendants of the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Rutledges, and of the thousand other names which adorn the pages of your revolutionary history, will not abandon that Union to support which so many of them fought and bled and died.

"In the spring of 1833," says his biographer, "he was chosen foreign associate of the Institute of France, (Academy of Moral and Political Science.) This distinction, which has always been sparingly conferred, which few Americans have reached, and which even monarchs can only attain through the double merit of genius and industry, he had not sought."

The spring of 1833 brought new changes. In April, Cora, the only surviving child of Mr. Livingston, was married to Thomas P. Barton, Esq., of Philadelphia, and immediately after the ceremony the President, in offering his congratulations, announced that Mr. Livingston was soon to go to France as Minister, and that he had selected Mr. Barton as Secretary of Legation. On the 29th of May Mr. Livingston resigned his office as senator, which he had held for two years, and on the same day he received his appointment as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to France. On the 14th of August he embarked, with his family, in the Delaware, ship of the line, and after a voyage of twenty-eight days, to which fine weather, excellent accommodations, and the agreeable society of the officers of the Delaware, gave the character of a party of pleasure, they arrived at Cherbourg.

He entered at once upon the duties of his mission, which was to obtain the payment of the large sum secured by treaty—the claim of the United States for indemnity on account of French spoliations under the Berlin and Milan Decrees, and the negotiation of a new treaty readjusting the commercial relations of the two countries. Mr. Livingston was received in a most

flattering manner by the king and the royal family, but the king apprehended, with good reason, a formidable resistance in the Chamber of Deputies. Six months elapsed before Mr. Livingston could obtain the definitive action of the Chamber on the subject, and that decision, by a majority of eight, was a refusal to make the appropriation. The President, in his annual message of December, 1834, recommended that the United States should take redress into their own hands, and that the Executive might be authorized to make reprisals upon French property, in case no provision should be made for payment of the debt at the then approaching session of the Chamber of Deputies. Intense feeling was aroused in France on the receipt of the contents of this message, and the Count de Rigney, Minister of Foreign Affairs, wrote to Mr. Livingston informing him that his majesty's government was preparing to present a bill for giving sanction to the treaty when the strange message of December came, and obliged it again to deliberate on what course it should pursue; that M. Serrurier would be ordered home from Washington.

Mr. Livingston's answer to the Count de Rigney was a spirited vindication of the President and his message, concluding with an appeal for the preservation of peace. He determined to await instructions from the President before he asked for his passports. The President was delighted with the letter to the Count de Rigney, which Mr. Van Buren said gave "the clearest, strongest, best-tempered views of the matter in controversy."

The official instructions of the President were, that if the appropriation should be rejected, he with all the legation should leave France in a United States ship of war; but if the appropriation should be made he should return to France or Belgium, leaving Mr. Barton as *Chargé d'Affaires*, and await further instructions. The bill passed on the 18th of April, with a proviso that the payment should not be made until the French government should have received satisfactory explanations of the terms used by the President in his annual message. Mr. Livingston, being thus left to his own judgment, resolved upon demanding his passports and coming home, leaving Mr. Barton in Paris as *Chargé d'Affaires*.

The frigate in which Mr. Livingston and his family were

brought home was commanded by Commodore Elliott, and arrived at New York the 23d of June. He was welcomed with popular enthusiasm, and he received repeated assurances of the satisfaction of the whole country, as well as of the President and Cabinet, with his course in the perplexing positions in which he had been placed in his mission to France.

Although past the threescore years and ten of human life, Mr. Livingston seemed just fitted in his green old age for the enjoyment of the quiet repose of Montgomery Place. With no public duties on his mind, he could indulge in the calm retrospect of a life well-spent, a laborious, useful life, devoted to high aims and great public interests. The over-worked man enjoyed with keen zest "the gorgeous fall foliage, listless sauntering, and nothing to do."

His clear intellect, his genial manners, his playful conversation gave his society an irresistible charm for his relatives, who had always esteemed him as an almost perfect specimen of humanity. One brother, John R. Livingston, and one sister, Mrs. Garrettson, were all that were left to him of that numerous band among whom his infant years were passed, and their homes were not far from his own. Clermont was at a short distance from Montgomery Place, and in this brief season of retirement his thoughts probably went back to the scenes of his boyhood as he reviewed his eventful life.

Once more he appeared in public life at Washington, in the Supreme Court, where he was engaged as senior counsel in the case of the Municipal Authorities of the city of New Orleans, appellants, *versus* the United States, respondents. Daniel Webster was his junior associate, while the other side was ably represented by Benjamin F. Butler, Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Butler cited largely from Mr. Livingston's pamphlet on the Batture case in terms of respect and approval that elicited from Mr. Livingston a digression most beautifully in place in his last public effort—most characteristic of the hour and the man. He said:

> That pamphlet was written under circumstances in which the author thought he had suffered grievous wrongs—wrongs which he thought, and still thinks, justified the warmth of language in which some parts of his argument are couched, but which his respect for the public and private character of his opponent always

obliged him to regret that he had been forced to use. He is happy, however, to say that at a subsequent period the friendly intercourse with which prior to that breach he had been honored was renewed; that the offended party forgot the injury, and that the other performed the more difficult task (if the maxim of a celebrated French author is true) of forgiving the man upon whom he had inflicted it. The court, I hope, will excuse this personal digression; but I could not avoid using this occasion of making known that I have been spared the lasting regret of reflecting that Jefferson had descended to the grave with a feeling of ill-will toward me.

On his return from Washington he spent the rest of the winter in New York, and the early spring found him "among his buds at Montgomery Place," anticipating a summer of quiet happiness. On the night of Friday, the 20th of May, he was attacked suddenly and violently with bilious colic, and suffered the next two days with excruciating bodily pain. His aged sister, Mrs. Garrettson, then in her eighty-fifth year, was a welcome visitant by that bed of pain, as she spoke of those consolations and hopes that alone can give comfort to the dying. On Monday, the 23d of May, 1836, five days before the completion of his seventy-second year, he calmly breathed his last. And at Montgomery Place, now the residence of his daughter, Mrs. Barton, his widow, who had been the grace and ornament of his home in public life, spent nearly a quarter of a century in retirement, loving to dwell upon the beautiful character and public services of her honored husband. She was for many years a Methodist, and she died in 1860, in communion with the Church of her choice.

Mr. Livingston's death called forth "a powerful tribute of sorrow from the public mind." A good and great man had passed away full of years and honors. In answer to his mother's prayer for her youngest and darling child, the word came to her with power: "With long life will I satisfy him." She immediately added, "And show him thy salvation."

The "long life" with which he was "satisfied" is rich in lessons as well as results. One of these is, that the valuable prizes of the world are the reward of industry as well as of genius. Edward Livingston's life was one of laborious industry from the time, when a boy at Clermont, he pursued his studies amid the distractions and tumults of war, till he returned from his foreign mission in the ripe wisdom of his threescore and

ten years. No vacant spaces, no hours unemployed in that busy life in which, while he maintained in the most beautiful exercise the charities flowing from the relations of son, brother, husband, father, and friend, he took his place at the head of the bar in two cities; gained an enviable reputation on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate; sustained, with wonderful ability, satire, and eloquence, his part of a controversy which for years attracted the public attention; produced, as the fruit of four years of intense labor, a code, which has been stamped with the approval of the wisest and best of his countrymen, as well as of many of the leading statesmen of the world; wrote, as Secretary of State, the most masterly state-papers; and in the closing work of his life, amid the perplexities of foreign diplomacy, vindicated the national honor, and received the approbation of his countrymen.

In his character there was a rare union of simplicity and greatness. With all his wisdom and learning he was simple as a child, manifesting in high positions a genuine modesty singularly attractive in a man of acknowledged ability. He had a brave and hopeful spirit, serene and dominant in the darkest hour. When the family were giving expression to their bitter disappointments at the loss of the code, his little daughter, nestling in her father's arms, cried out, "It would have been better for me to be burned than the code." "Never mind, never mind, my daughter," he said, tenderly caressing her, "you shall see it rise like the phenix from its ashes." No time was given to vain regrets. His work was in the living present. The next day his wife and daughter saw him come in from his early morning walk with a roll of paper, a bunch of quills, and a bottle of ink—materials just purchased to begin anew the work to which he had given his strength for two years, and to which he now addressed himself with unfaltering energy and perseverance.

The depth and tenderness of his character was manifested in the most beautiful manner in his conjugal and parental relations. His letters to his son would lead us to exclaim, "Blessed is the son of such a father, and the father of such a son." A gentleman of high position closed the book, after their perusal, with the expression of regret, never before so deeply felt, that his boyhood had known no such wise and loving care.

Such a life needs no eulogy. The mere record of its deeds places him who has done so great a part of the world's work among the benefactors of his race, and the story of this life, so well told, cannot fail to be read with interest and with pleasure.

Art. IV.—THE BATTLE OF BLENHEIM.

The Life and Times of Louis XIV. By G. P. R. James. Two volumes. London: Henry G. Bohn. 1851.

Siècle de Louis XIV. Tome XX. Œuvres de Voltaire. A Paris: Firmin Didot Frères. 1830.

Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough: with his Original Correspondence collected from the Family Records at Blenheim, and other Authentic Sources. Illustrated with Portraits, Maps, and Military Plans. By William Coxe, F.R.S., F.S.A., Archdeacon of Wilts. Six volumes and Atlas. London: Longman. 1820.

The History of England from the Accession of James II. By Thomas Babington Macaulay. Four volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856.

Blenheim is one of the pivotal points in human history. On the morning of August 13, 1704, about this little village in the center of Europe gathered not merely Anglo-Austrian and Franco-Bavarian forces, but all the interests of humanity against all its perils. One system of government, philosophy, and religion was placed in the scale against another. And when we consider the advantage of position, strength, and prestige in favor of centralization and despotism in government, the most reckless skepticism in philosophy and subserviency in religion, against democratic principles, progression in philosophy, and reasonable faith in religion, we cannot but think that God put his heavy hand in the scale and turned it right for coming ages.

The works above named may help to understand the event and its relations. The first is a history of a French era by an Englishman—the history of Carthage by a Roman. The second the history of the same French era by a representative

Frenchman, the sovereign writer and author king of his century. Both were exuberant writers of fiction. In writing history they carry imagination among their facts. The first, seeking the dark and revolting elements of human character, induces us to suspect that he turns to historical studies to aid in his regular business of producing novels. The second, though searching for and often developing historical truth, arrays history with the splendors of a fancy which loves meretricious glory rather than humanity, and loves the gorgeous none the less because it is composed of the hues of imperial despotism, or borrows its brilliancy from the phosphorescent glimmer of moral and political corruption, or from the gleam of banners and bayonets and the blaze of burning cities.

For information on the other side, two historians have been chosen who are not surpassed for diligence of research, clear statement of conclusions, and accuracy of historic assertions. The first finds his hero great in all departments, ministerial, military, and financial, beyond the lot of many if not any other man. The second limns this so-called nations' benefactor and world's redeemer in colors dark, proportions uncouth, expression malign, springing from a soul most despicable. Not content with this, he seeks to fix suspicion of a woman's heaviest sin upon his wife, that she may be "fit body to fit head."

Our view of the importance of the event is indicated in the opening paragraph. A proper estimate of the men that acted in the drama is less important; for there is One that can use a Pharoah for the unification of his people, bringing a terrific pressure of severity to bear on individual elements and tribal strata, fused in affliction's furnace, producing an uncleavable granite unity that resists all conceivable disintegrating agencies. There is One that can deliver trembling armies by a shepherd's sling; that can give a Corsican lieutenant power to grasp a sheaf of scepters, and who can crush that power with snowflakes. Remembering this, we never gauge men so much by the splendor of events in which they move, as by the lesser acts of cooler moments, showing the usual working of character under usual motives.

Previous to the battle of Blenheim there had been in government, philosophy, and religion a long preparation for man's harm, and an equally long preparation for man's good. The

interminable war between these two tendencies here reached a crisis. They had skirmished before. Here came their Waterloo. In the preparations for this conflict, centuries long, patiently made, guided by the best men, urged on by every possible energy of the worst, forwarded and retarded on either side by thousands that were aware or ignorant of the mighty interests at stake, centering at last the convergent armies of nations to a given point; in these preparations, so vast over countries so wide and ages so long, we may see the momentous importance of the impending fight.

Let us trace the separate and intrinsically different courses of government, philosophy, and religion previous to the time when they were pitted against each other in their decisive struggle.

The governmental policy of neither France nor England had been developed in any single reign. The forms they presented stood as the result of many sculptors, working at different times with different aims, and leaving the results with somewhat disproportionate parts. But while their parts differed from one another specifically, the forms differed generically.

The general dissolution of all authority and law that followed the death of Charlemagne brought into supremacy that primal law of human nature, every man for himself. In the confusion that followed the weak were glad to put themselves under the strong, even to the extent of abject servitude; for if they were oppressed they were protected from utter ruin. Even misers seldom think it best to slay the bird laying golden eggs for the dubious prospect of a mine. The feudal system culminated, declined, and produced the worst effects possible for any system of selfish power, divided into innumerable factions, each hostile to each, with elements of discord in every petty fief of a dozen acres, with the most unmitigable slavery of equal races, till, in the weakness of the nation, English invaders, barbarian superstition, and popish bigotry rendered the two and a half centuries of the Valois kings, ending in 1589, most lamentably disastrous to every interest of the French nation.

The law of physics, that carries the pendulum as far beyond the center as it had previously been drawn on the hither side, holds good in philosophy, religion, and government. Segregation had failed, aggregation must follow. Petty fiefs must give

way to colossal empire. Here was the auspicious moment to balance prerogative and privilege. Wise-men saw the propitious hour. The states-general was convoked in the time of John of Valois. This assembly and the tumultuous multitude sought to gain some chartered rights, as the barons, a century and a half before, did from John of England. Alas, that they lacked the indomitable perseverance to achieve them! In this constitutional crisis of France despotism triumphed. But the spirit of liberty is immortal. It renewed its contest with prerogative in succeeding reigns, always defeated, till Charles VII., made conqueror by the immortal frenzy of Joan d'Arc in the hour of victory and uncautious thanksgiving, stole from France its last safeguard of constitutional freedom. He established an army, maintained by a perpetual tax, irrespective of any legislative assembly. This army, thus maintained, was all that tyranny could ask. Liberty called for arms. A war for the public good, as it was called, followed in the reign of Louis XI. Proving victor, he found fresh occasion for the further restriction of liberty, and greater exercise of despotic power. Here ends the constitutional struggle. A few words on the development of the system.

Reacting from feudalism, the ruling policy of the sixteenth century was to enlarge the national territory, irrespective of natural boundaries, affinities of peoples, or commercial relations. Charles VIII., Louis XII., Francis I., and Henry II., all descended into Italy. Charles V., of Germany and Spain, and Philip II., were not slow to follow such illustrious examples. Poor unhappy Italy, first leaguing herself with one and then the other, shifting desperately to make her two enemies fight each other, spoiled by both, reaped, both in property and character, all the degrading results of duplicity and intrigue. Meanwhile for this great end of foreign spoil every resource of internal advantage was neglected. The increase of population went to renew armies, the produce of the arts to sustain them. The spirit of the people was made warlike, military fame the only proper ambition. Every interest of the people was neglected, every possible tax imposed, and every interest of the country misdirected or repressed. For empires of heterogeneous masses must be agglomerated, despite the depopulation and waste of the original kingdom by the effort of conquest and the imi-

nent peril of civil war among elements so admirably adapted to that end.

This very result, civil war, followed. Always most fierce and sanguinary, this was intensified in horror by being fired with religious fanaticism, till on a given signal, by the connivance and active participation of all the nobles, priests, and best men of the kingdom, seventy thousand were murdered; neighbors, friends, relatives murdered without the maddening strife of war! Sanctioned by public authority, urged by the chief men of the nation, defended from Rome, approved by the priests as acceptable to heaven, this horrid holocaust was offered, not in expiation of previous crime, but an evidence of deep, damning depravity beyond name. Even when this was done, unshocked by the crime, the Romish clergy formed a league for the utter extirpation of the Protestants and the management of the king. Meanwhile the blazing *auto de fés* of Philip II. in Spain, and the thirty years' religious war in Germany, gave small assurance of better things for man in Europe. The close of these wars in France brings us within two monarchs, or sixty years of Louis XIV. How much improvement was made under these Bourbon kings we will now examine.

Henry IV., the first of the house of Bourbon, was a Protestant. But let us not suspect that religious names had any relation to religion. Married to a Catholic seven days before the massacre of St. Bartholomew, he saved his life by apostasy from his nominal faith. He came to the throne by the murder of the Duke of Guise and Henry III., and by the second abjuration of Protestantism; established himself by years of internal war, passed his life in the grossest licentiousness, a slave to the passion for gambling, and died by the dagger of Ravaillac.

That the internal condition of France could improve under such a monarch shows the desperate state of her previous fortunes. But while agriculture was developed, commerce and art encouraged, and toleration promulgated by the edict of Nantes, no permanent good, no security for the rights of men, no bulwark against future tyranny or amelioration of the present, no advance in the constitution of the kingdom was achieved. The only item in the Constitution that had any relation to preserving the rights of men was that Parliament held the right to *register* the edicts of the king. How ready these supple bodies

were to do the king's pleasure may be seen by the following characterization of them from the Henriade of Voltaire: "Inefficient assemblies, where laws were proposed rather than executed, and where abuses were detailed with eloquence, but not remedied."

Things went from bad to worse under Louis XIII., who, after a childless marriage of twenty-two years, having been reconciled to his hated queen by her deception, became the father of Louis XIV.

Louis XIV. announced his whole policy in a single line. *L'état c'est moi*, a sentiment adjudged blasphemous by all the sacred laws of civil society. His reign was splendid, but it was with that splendor peculiarly appreciable in France, foreign conquest and elegant debauchery. For the first the state of Europe was peculiarly favorable; for the second there never was any lack of opportunity or disposition in France. Charles II. of England was bribed, and made to declare war against his tried allies. Spain was weakened by dissensions among her widely-scattered, ill-compacted kingdoms; Germany torn by civil wars; Holland wasted by attempts to conquer Brazil, and at the same time consumed as to her vitals by internal strife. Then the great central power of Louis XIV. was wielded against the broken nationalities, and towns, fortresses, principalities were gathered as a reaper gathers grain. But as time passed on things changed in England, and when there was no power on the continent that could stay the vaulting ambition of the French monarch, the islands of the sea put themselves in his path, to vindicate the interests of man or be crushed by the colossal Juggernaut of power.

Much as Louis had succeeded for himself and France, he had made nothing secure. No constitutional bulwark restricted the unbounded abuse of power by himself or any succeeding king. No *habeas corpus* act existed. No trial by jury was guaranteed. France was not a monarchy tempered by a constitution and legislative assemblies. It was a despotism that could be tempered only by revolution and assassination. No tide of influence could flood up from the ruled to the ruler, except when the last fiber of endurance snapped seas of human beings surged round the uncaring author of their woes, either to be trampled down by armies or ruined afresh by revolution. That

government that takes away responsibility from the ruled is destructive of the best powers of man: powers that can be developed only in those whom God made to be responsible agents. When man has none of the rights of man committed to his care his soul narrows to the grasping, withering care of self. Better be a peasant in a republic than a courtier under despotism.

The social state of the kingdom was loathsome. The king had many children by his wife, more by his mistresses, Montespan alone bearing him six. Nations change their policy by some imminent foreign danger or evident domestic advantage. Louis changed his when he changed mistresses, and by their friends whom they brought into power. So that when the royal favor meant crime, and in any proper society would have meant infamy, it was eagerly sought by ladies of high rank; for, obtaining it, they obtained not the dalliance of the monarch's leisure hours alone, but some control of the nation's destinies. Masterly statesmen eagerly urged the prostitution of near female relatives, that by their shame, then accounted honor, they might gather influence and reins of power. Whoever sees the fruits of these things in the succeeding reign will thank God that the destinies of the race were not longer periled by the unchecked prevalence of such a system of government.

Turn now to the preparations for man's good in the department of government. The nation that chiefly contended that fateful field of Blenheim against France had a far different training, arrived at a far different result. Commencing in a union of different races, in itself almost a pledge of success, it abolished the domination of one race over another, and quickly added the abolition of the right of man to property in man. From her earliest history three unbreachable barriers have been held against the encroachments of kingly power. The fight over these has been desperate at times. Some tyrants have forced a momentary passage, only to receive terrible punishment for their headlong temerity. This triple line of defenses kept human rights secure, namely, the king could not legislate without consent of Parliament; could not tax the people without the action of their representatives, and was bound to conduct his executive in conformity with the laws on peril of his throne or head.

All the limited monarchies of the continent became absolute in the middle ages because of the seeming necessity of standing armies. These must be wielded by the king, and hence he becomes independent. The insular position of England saved her the necessity of such an army, until the people had learned that they held over the king a power greater than he over them. For if he held power, they held its origin and continuance, the purse.

In 1215 that charter of the rights of the governed, then and in all ages deservedly called Great, was obtained. At that early time human rights were made more sacred in England than they have become in many other monarchies even yet. Not that England obtained in the thirteenth century a perfect constitution, but from such splendid beginnings she has maintained freedom, liberty, and a measure of equal justice to an extent unknown in any other country. Freedom of speech obtained in spite of the efforts of Henry IV. and Elizabeth to prevent it. After many hard contests, productive of mutual respect, England and Scotland united their fortunes, to the obvious advantage of both. King Charles I. attempted to wring from the people their ancient chartered rights, but had speedily wrung from him the enlargement and reiteration of that charter. Disregarding this, the Long Parliament, having first put its own existence beyond the pleasure or displeasure of the king, enacted that a Parliament should assemble every three years, at the king's call or without it. It abolished his inquisitions, called Star Chamber and High Commission; impeached and imprisoned his ministers, righted wrongs with a vigorous hand, and when the king proved hypocritical, treacherous, and tyrannous, removed the trouble by removing his head. The unequaled grandeur of the act lies in the fact that it was done by law, and not by revolution or murder. Popular right surpassed kingly might.

Then arose the Commonwealth, in which every right was safe at home, and those of distant unknown peoples extorted from unwilling hands.

Proverbially untractable as kings are, Charles II. and James II. sought to do the very things that had cost the life of the father of the one and was about to cost the crown of the other. Revolution followed, and William of Orange, fresh from the

Dutch Republic, gathered up the reins of power that these self-sufficient Phaëthons proved incompetent to hold, and the blazing chariot of civil and religious liberty wheeled once more to its beneficent path. A Bill of Rights, that completely renovated the abused constitution of the realm, was enacted. Toleration was promulgated. A bill was framed to keep the legislature pure, by incapacitating its members from holding any office as a bribe from the crown. Slightly modified, it passed in the reign of his successor. Venal parliaments had been able to sit interminably. Hence a new triennial bill returned them to the people every three years. Treason was defined. No man could be indicted but on the oath of at least two witnesses. A copy of the indictment must be furnished the accused, also a list of his jury, counsel for his defense, and power to summon witnesses. No wonder Vattel, looking from his land over the channel, exclaimed, (Law of Nations, p. 63,) "Happy constitution! which they did not suddenly obtain It has cost rivers of blood, but they have not purchased it too dear!"

Thus England went to war, not for chimerical ideas and Utopian schemes, but for rights guaranteed to all her subjects. In her crown glittered all the stars that had been symbols of hope; in her hand gleamed the judicial sword, wielded by all the strength justice and hope could give. She took her place beside the Dutch Republic, an old enemy of tyranny that for a hundred and fifty years had waged the dubious fight. Weak and alone, she had not stopped to measure the strength of the empire of Philip II.; she opposed it. Girt with the strength of right, and fired with the impulses of freedom, the unknown province became the first power of Europe, and the shattered empire was content to receive peace at her dictation.

The Dutch Republic was an organized protest against ecclesiastical tyranny and universal dominion. It took its very beginning when the empire of Charles V. had swallowed up every vestige of human freedom. It was man's only champion in the sixteenth century. England stood by her in the seventeenth. Descendants from both took the championship in America in the eighteenth. Good cause had Holland to oppose Louis XIV. Provinces, states, fortresses, and cities had been seized by his resistless hand. She battled for existence, and in

contending for her own secured the well-being of man. She gave England one of her wisest kings; and united in blood, fortune, and interest, both went forth to battle. Thus the two systems of government were opposed, every interest of man against his every peril.

Let us turn a moment to view the position of

PHILOSOPHY.

All ideas properly belong to the province of philosophy; but having taken out the departments of government and religion for separate treatment, all else relative to the subject remains for present consideration. We cannot minutely follow all the systems of metaphysical speculation. Being as often results as causes, as often growing out of popular tendencies as creating them, in the one case indices of what national thought has been, and in the other of what it will be, in either case their general principles will clearly indicate national tendencies.

At the mention of philosophy who does not think of Bacon, who uttered the first protest against the fetters of the Aristotelian philosophy. Men turned at his bidding from hypotheses to facts, from trimming things to theories, to conforming theories to actual verities. His whole work means independence. He sounded a trumpet for a charge on the realms of darkness. Thousands in every land sprang up armed with his weapons, and according to his methods made wide conquests in the realm of ignorance and old night. Well says Burke: "Who is there that upon hearing the name of Lord Bacon does not instantly think of everything of genius the most profound, everything in literature the most extensive, everything in discovery the most penetrating, everything of observation on human life the most distinguished and refined!" Whom does France offer as his equal? Even La Place, a hundred and fifty years later, could only follow Newton, and say his Principia held pre-eminence over all other productions of the human mind. With Bacon and Newton, England scarce need fear superiority in physical science. Turning to psychology, we are confronted by Locke. His philosophy was imperfect rather than wrong. The wrong has been in the carrying out, which it received at the hands of others. Conclusions drawn, by the sensual school, from his not properly defined premises, were

distinctly repudiated by him. The remark of Cousin is significant: "It was necessary that the philosophy of Locke should pass the channel in order to meet with success." What harm there was in Locke took little root in England. The soil was not congenial. It blew over the channel and sprang into luxuriant growth. The whole sensual school, led by Condillac, Cabanis, De Tracy, Volney, and last, Broussais, the reviver of the first, caught its inspiration from Locke. To resolve everything into mere sensation was the object of Condillac's later and most finished work, *Le Traitè des Sensations.* The whole contest in France, from the time of Louis XIV., when the Cartesian philosophy rapidly gave way, till the appearance of Kant, was to get the worst out of the prevailing Lockian philosophy. The whole contest in England was to get the best. Scotland put in a protest against materialism, and in seeking to defend Locke against the imputation of it, only showed him to be inconsistent. On the one hand, the good of the system was adhered to and its errors ignored; on the other, the errors only adopted and greatly increased.

Though France had taken the universal doubt, that is, the alpha of Des Cartes' system, she followed not his "method" for the discovery of truth, was much more in sympathy with the development of his errors in the subtile pantheism of Malebranche, or the open fatalism of Spinoza. The tendencies of the French mind culminated in the atheism of Voltaire, the encyclopedic writers, and in revolution. Those of the English in common sense and reformation.

Freedom of the press deserves consideration. Intelligence and liberty spread or dwindle as this is allowed or restricted. The first step is to appoint a licenser; the next to allow perfect freedom of publishing, a general law declaring what is prejudicial to the morals of the state. The system is perfected when conviction is put in the hands of a jury, the amount of punishment in the hands of the judges. England early advanced near this ultimatum. France never yet got beyond the first step, which means freedom of the press to the extent of the caprice of the licenser, or the option of the tyrant appointing him.

A glance at the literature produced by the two countries shows the enormous potency of this single principle. It shall be sufficient to mention names previous to 1701. Shakspeare,

Bacon, the Johnsons, Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Bunyan, Locke, Swift, Addison, Newton. Who shall be named on the other side their equals? Both national taste and government patronage encouraged dramatic productions. Is there a French Shakspeare? Shut out from politics, the mind rushes more eagerly into literature. Has France an Addison? The whole animus of government and religion was against the highest mental culture. Yet the age of Louis XIV. is called the Augustan age. The comparison is truer than it seems. In the age of Augustus, Horace, Ovid, Catullus, all contemptibly sycophantic and sensual, some beastial and infamous, were in highest favor at court. Such elegant triflers were most welcome at the court of Louis XIV. In the Augustan age Cicero was banished and assassinated. So, in the parallel, Pascal was persecuted, Madame Guyon arrested, Fenelon and Quesnel exiled. The religion of the state had thoroughly established its modern system of crushing out human thought. From being the preserver of letters in the dark ages, the Romish Church since the time of Galilleo, in 1633, has bent its every energy to dwarf and crush the intellect of man. Having subserviency for its central point of doctrine, taught by Luther the terrible results of free inquiry, every possible appliance must be made use of to crush free and enlarged thought. The character of the Church may be best understood, its history best read from this stand-point. Its fearful success in this respect is the darkest page of history.

It is usual to speak much of the darkness and ignorance of England in the seventeenth century. This appears excessive, partly by a just view of the real darkness of the time, and partly by contrast with the glorious light of religious reformation that followed. But dark as England was, it was very different from the darkness it opposed. There were lights in its darkness. Stars flashing in its sky. The lights in the darkness it opposed might be compared to these same stars reflected in the bosom of a putrid pool. England had real stars; morning stars; heralds of a dawn that tarried not. And when the day burst and the sun appeared, those pools that had seemed to burn with holy light were clearly seen, loathsome, miasmatic, deadly.

Holland, the opposer of Louis XIV. and ally of England,

also had a most noticeable development of mind. The Republic, preserving inviolable the liberty of the press, the right of assembly and petition, and engaging every citizen in the conduct of public affairs, had done a republic's work in quickening, freeing, and enlarging mind. The words and sufferings of Grotius did not vindicate toleration in vain. Arminianism, which has always been allied with liberty, was defined by Episcopius at the Synod of Dort, 1618. The tenet of free-will does as much to dignify and free the human mind as that of necessity degrades and enslaves it.

With such achievements and tendencies for good and ill, philosophy saw with anxiety that contest that was to determine the prowess and reign of its different supporters.

RELIGION.

To comprehend the religious interests that were at stake in this battle, it will be necessary to glance at the history and define the actual position of the Romish and Protestant Churches. The beginning of the seventeenth century is distinguished for a remarkable outspread and triumph of the Romish Church. By vast colonies and conquests by Romish countries, by unusually successful missions, and a quiet strengthening of the central power, it seemed about to grasp the universal supremacy it sought. But the growth of intelligence, the spirit of liberty, and the wane of religious impulse, resulting in a successful thirty-years war for Protestantism in Germany, brought a check on its success.

Just at this point, Pope Urban VIII. sought to stay the decline of the Church by perfecting its temporal policy, and adding new political states to the papal crown. But fierce political wrangling for spoils brought little strength or unity of purpose to the Church. Popes succeeded each other with a rapidity that suggests those temporal sovereignties that are tempered by assassination. These shepherds wore ovine names — Clement, Innocent, etc.—but they covered lupine natures. Pasquin might have said of such shepherds, "Sometimes they feed the sheep, often they shear them, always make mutton of them." Contrary to Scripture, they warred with principalities and powers, and not against wickedness in high places. And if their weapons were spiritual, they were of the

kind described by Milton, when there was war in heaven. Clement IX., of whose excellence every one speaks, distributed to his electors $600,000, said to be previously agreed upon. No wonder papal debts got so heavy. Well said Casimir Delavigne, "Les sept péchés mortels ont porté la tiare."

About the middle of the seventeenth century, the whole character of the Jesuit order was changed. From ascetic monks they became prime ministers. From feeding beggars they began to confess princes. Their tenets also changed, so that sin was almost an impossibility. "The yoke of Christ," said one, "has become marvelously easy."

Just about this time Cornelius Jansè, afterward known as Jansenius, undertook a reform as elevating as the other was corrupting; as pure as the other was base. Well-nigh right in doctrine, quite right in practice, exalting the grace of God, abating the preposterous values assumed for works, imbued with the spirit of the Scriptures, he differed from Luther chiefly in this, that he regarded the Bible *and* the early fathers as giving the ground of practice and faith. Together with St. Cyran, the literary academy of Port Royal was established, where the Scriptures were translated, school books produced, and holy thoughts, from such minds as Pascal's, prepared for the whole people.

Popery must choose between these two rival sects. It did not take long. Rome quickly and infallibly perceived its affinities. The whole weight of the Church, wielded by Richelieu, was hurled against the Jansenists, then the only hope of the papal Church. Infallibility declared certain heresies to be taught by Jansenius's works. All his followers declared the contrary. But infallibility cannot argue, so the whole principle of toleration must be put down. Hence the rights granted to Protestants by the edict of Nantes were revoked, (1685.) and half a million of prosperous citizens of France exposed to the rapacity and violence of the Catholic soldiery: an act of perfidy impossible to Punic faith, comparatively easy for a Church capable of a general massacre of dissenters. Louis XIV. broke through every law, human and divine, to perpetrate this enormous crime, for the purpose of appeasing the head of the Church of Rome, who had contended fiercely with him, not for the amelioration of excessive taxes, not for lenity in arbi-

trary and life-long imprisonments, not for any appearance of decency in the court of him who called himself "most Christian," but for the revenues of certain sees. The savage brings bloody scalps to please his brutal mistress; fires of persecution and most outrageous murder appropriately appear to placate his offended holiness. This was the condition and character of the Church seeking universal supremacy under the banners of all-victorious Louis XIV. If such be religion, how blessed it must be to be wicked!

Let us compare the history and position of Protestantism. From the days of Luther it had contended for a legal right to live. This it obtained, by force of arms wielded by the Smalkeldic League, at the peace of Passau, 1555. This was the first point gained in the contest for the right to think. Alas! so long trained to contention, Lutherans and Zwinglians could not tolerate each other. Favored by Maximilian II., severely tried by Rudolph II. and Matthias, Protestantism staked its every interest on the valor and wisdom of the Elector Palatine. In vain; the cause and occasion surpassed the man. Then Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, with a few thousand men, confronted the colossal Austrian power. Minor states rallied to his banner. The many weak opposed the one strong. But though Gustavus left his mangled body on the field of Lützen, the cause survived, and by the treaty of Westphalia, 1648, Protestants became equal before the law. Liberty of conscience was secured; the many little Protestant states escaped being swallowed up by Catholic Austria; and, best of all, the Protestant sects learned that they had a common cause. Together they wielded their arms at Blenheim against another threatening annihilation.

Space forbids our tracing the history of religion in the chief Protestant power that risked so much in that battle. There are dark pages in its history, as well as light. But Protestant intolerance, imprisonment, and infliction of death, only show the kind of education men had received from the papal Church. The bitterness of animosity, the length of its continuance, show how thoroughly the lesson had been taught. But already the chief faults of the Church were behind her. Every year she was more free from the savage brutality and crushing bigotry that men had put into God's religion. As surely as the Roman

Church had in it seeds of death, producing a constant increase of a hundredfold, so surely had the opposing Church seeds of life for itself and all the world. For with all its faults, Protestantism held aloft an open Bible. The fountain of divine life and light was free for all. The stultifying assumptions of human infallibility were spurned. The unshackled mind leaped upward. No wonder if it leaped somewhat wildly. Every possible good for man lay in that open Bible. It was the one book of England and Scotland; it made iron men for the armies of the Commonwealth; it created the leaders of thought and action for coming time. This same regenerating word of God had free course in Holland and Germany. All its fruits Romanism opposed; with what energy is indicated in a remark of Pius V., that all the property of the Church, crosses and chalices not excepted, should be used in an expedition against England. Romanism opposed free government, general intelligence, right to think, progress in liberal arts, the free course of God's word, and Christ's reign; offering instead despotism without mitigation, fetters for the intellect, a Bible chained, a morality most loathsome, a surveillance unceasing, punishments most severe, death for attempted reforms, and the reign of the devil as the vicegerent of Christ.

Now comes the conflict. There, at the east, on that rising ground beyond the river Nebel, are sixty-five thousand men. Away to the south the village and marsh of Lutzingen makes strong their left flank. Palisades and intrenchments make strong the line. Away to the north the masonry houses of Blenheim are filled with the soldiers of their right flank. Here are fifty-two thousand men; they must go down this broken and difficult descent, through the river, up that ascent of ground; must force those intrenchments, take those cannon, scatter those superior numbers. Fearful odds against the attacking party.

But God's interests are at stake. Let us invoke his aid. It is done, by command of the chief, at the head of every regiment. Forward! — We cannot trace the difficult progress; the thrice repeated repulse; enough that complete success at length crowned the arms of freedom and religion.

Theirs was no barren victory. It is not to be accounted complete because of standards, cannon, or other trophies taken,

nor because of that great army not twenty thousand could ever be gathered again; but because the vast despotic schemes of Louis were foiled; because England could enjoy and propagate her liberal constitution; because American colonies were not brought under the yoke that was being put on Europe; because Holland could still be free: and when England forgot her duty in 1775, Holland was able to render essential aid to the American cause.

The further spread of French literature and theories of social science by the fostering patronage of despotic power was hereby checked, and better thought, truer science, and purer morals were helped by the prestige of the dominant power.

In religion the effect was no less evident. Almost immediately after the battle three of the five great powers that determined the policy of Europe were anti-Papal. As soon as 1709 the papal see lost its umpireship among the Catholic powers. By the peace of Utrecht, Sicily and Sardinia, fiefs of the papal crown, were assigned to other sovereignties without the pope being even consulted. Soon after, in his immediate neighborhood, the temporal power of the pope was annihilated. In 1799 the pope's very palace was plundered, his ring torn from his hand, food and clothes denied him, and he himself led away to prison in contempt, with scarce a friend on earth to strike a blow for his deliverance, or utter a protest against his wrongs. Antichrist fell nine days from his attempted usurpation of heaven to his place in hell. Popery fell a century from its usurped height of religious and political power, to a depth from which there is no reascension.

Protestantism found itself the leading moral and political power. The world's commerce was coming into its hands. The world's riches were pouring into its lap. One who was mastering the rudiments of walking at the time of the battle of Blenheim, afterward carried the banner of free grace and a pure life over myriads of miles. The reformation of England under Wesley was the result. The reformation of the world by his doctrine is yet to follow.

Let none despair of the triumph of God's cause. In the time of its darkness he shines forth; in the time of its weakness his arm is not shortened. Though men despaired of the world's conversion when government, philosophy, and even religion

opposed it, and hence interpreted the Scriptures in favor of a personal reign of Christ, they should now take heart, put greater trust in God, and, with government, philosophy, and religion as allies, declare that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

Art. V.—THE NICODEMITES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Periods of great civil commotion are wont to develop at least three classes of characters, each easily distinguished from the others. On the one hand are seen the lovers of novelty or friends of reform, whose motives are not always above the suspicion, whether just or otherwise, that they are not less influenced by their restless instability than by a desire to ameliorate the condition of their fellow-men. On the other, stand the avowed opponents of change, whom native temperament or interest, or both, render averse to any alteration in the existing *regime:* lovers of order, they style themselves; but with them order is a cold, lifeless thing, which denies the possibility or expediency of attempting to introduce any improvement, while it tolerates the slow but sure progress of that degeneration which is innate in every corrupt system. And between the two there is a large and intelligent class of persons who, while they sympathize completely with neither of the extremes, see much that is excellent in each. The veneration for antiquity professed by one side, and the necessity of reform which is the pass-word of the other, are both accepted; and thus these moderates might be mistaken for adherents of either dogma, but for the fact that they neither believe that ancient abuses ought to be maintained at any risk, nor that reforms ought to be purchased at any cost.

As it is in civil, so is it also in those great religious movements, which, if they produce a less immediate and sensible effect upon the external constitution of human society, are far more lasting in their results, and tend ultimately to renovate

the face of the world. The force of conviction operating upon natures originally frank, impulsive, and more inclined to weigh truth than to calculate probabilities of failure, gives rise to examples of rare enthusiastic devotion to what is believed to be the cause of God, of true religion, and of the enfranchisement of the human intellect and heart. These are the men who venture single-handed, or supported only by such auxiliaries as their eloquent appeals have gathered around them, to attack the time-hallowed systems of error which have usurped the places once occupied by truth. They are confronted with a scarcely less determined resolve by those who can conceive of no proof of doctrinal orthodoxy so strong as that derived from prescription, nor any test of heterodoxy more convincing than its opposition to the commonly received notions of the men of past centuries. From the eyes of the men of this latter class the ivy of antiquity, with its dense mantle of green foliage, quite conceals the rents and fissures which run through the old tower in every direction, and threaten to change at any moment that which is so graceful in its proportions into an unsightly ruin. Here again a third party takes a middle ground. While conceding that there is but too much of truth in the pictures which are drawn of the corruptions of the Church and its institutions, and that the need of reform is imperative, and perhaps at first making common cause with the more thoroughly convinced reformers, they are soon appalled at the wide sweep of the movement in which they have embarked. They shudder at the contempt of dignities, at the unsparing assaults upon that which has remained hitherto unquestioned in its supremacy, at the iconoclastic zeal of the reformers. They half suspect that they may have made some mistake in their investigations, when they find that the hearty espousal of their sentiments by men of less timidity is revolutionizing the Church, and, for aught they can see to the contrary, may involve the overthrow of the civil government also. Instead, therefore, of following the impulse of their better natures, they gradually work their way out of the current, which flows on and leaves them but little further advanced than when they first began to move. In spite of conscientious convictions of duty, they relapse into an external or partial conformity with the system which they have often publicly

denounced as erroneous. And they endeavor to satisfy themselves and others with the theory that since the true God can be worshiped acceptably only by those who worship him in spirit, therefore it is only the worship of the heart which is of any great moment; the exterior is unimportant, for the heart may refuse its consent to much to which the body submits through deference to the opinion of the world. It is therefore fool-hardiness needlessly to expose one's life to persecutions, from which a little dissembling will shield. The *offense* of the Gospel is thus done away. So convenient a doctrine has always been, and ever will be, popular in seasons of persecution.

The great Reformation of the sixteenth century presents us with signal examples of individuals or entire classes of persons espousing these delusive principles, in greater or less numbers, according to the various countries through which that remarkable awakening spread. They were more numerous where the cruel legislation against heretics warned converts to the "new doctrines" of the fiery trial through which an open profession must compel them to pass. They were fewer where so decided a majority of the population threw off their allegiance to Rome, or the government itself was so favorable to the Reformation, that the prospect of being called to seal the confession of the Gospel with a martyr's death was distant and indistinct. In France, where the theological faculty of the most famous university of Christendom, at the first note of the Reformation, prepared for a sanguinary conflict, and declared that it was absurd to suppose that God had reserved the discovery of what is necessary to the salvation of the faithful to be made by Luther alone; as though Christ had left his spouse, the Church, until now in darkness and the blindness of error; and that such teachings were a denial of the first principles of the faith, an open profession of impiety, an arrogance so extravagant as to need to be repressed by chains, censures, nay, by fire and flames, rather than refuted by argument;* where the courts of justice, with the Parliament at their head, resorted at once to the most severe measures to stifle the nascent reform, and burned men, women, and chil-

* Determinatio Theologorum Parisiensium super doctrina Lutheriana, in Bretschneider, Corpus Reformatorum. T. i, pp. 366, seq.

dren at slow fires, cunningly devising contrivances for lengthening the lives of the sufferers, that they might protract their agonies; in France, as might have been expected, the number of those who endeavored to avoid prison and the stake by an external compliance with the ordinances of the Roman Catholic religion was very great, and it comprised persons of every grade in social life, from those who were near to the throne to the poorest subjects of the king. The reformers themselves, those brave men who, in defense of the faith which had been implanted in their bosoms by the Holy Ghost, were not slow in exposing themselves to any danger which might await them in the discharge of their duty, denominated these timid and compromising brethren, who had not the courage openly to defend the hope that was in them, *Nicodemites*, after the member of the Sanhedrim who, though he was convinced of the divine mission of Jesus, would come to him for instruction only by night for fear of the Jews. Witnesses as they were of the incalculable mischief which had been inflicted upon the cause that was dearest to their hearts by the weakness of these fearful souls, it must not surprise us to find them denouncing their sin in no measured terms. They warned them of the impending anger of God, of his rejection of all worship which is offered by impure lips, of the ruin in which all shall be involved who continue to defile the service of the Almighty by interningling with it heathen rites. Farel and Calvin were, as we shall see, peculiarly strenuous in urging upon their converts an entire renunciation of the errors of Romanism. The fatal results of an opposite course were indeed so potent in the examples of a number of prominent personages who had at first declared in favor of a reformation, that there was scarcely an excuse for those who should persist in following in their steps.

Prominent among those who embraced the cause of the Reformation of the Church during the early part of the history of that movement was the Count of Montbrun, William Briconnet. This singular man, with whose name is linked, in the memory of the student of history, so much of mingled pleasure and sadness, was of high rank and extensive influence. His father, better known as the Cardinal of St. Malo, after serving Louis XI. in the civil administration, had been rewarded

by receiving the abbacy of St. Germain-des-Prés and the archbishopric of Reims; and in virtue of the latter office, he had anointed Louis XII. at his accession. The pope gratified the French monarch by giving the archbishop a cardinal's hat; but Briçonnet the elder, more mindful of his obligations to his king than of his allegiance to the holy see, not only headed the French party in the consistory, but ventured to brave the resentment of the Roman court by joining the council of Pisa, which Louis XII. had caused to be convoked in order to resist the papal encroachments. The younger Briçonnet, born before his father's ordination, was destined to meet with equal favor. Rich benefices were heaped upon him. He was made archdeacon of Reims and of Avignon, then abbot of the same rich foundation of St. Germain which his father had obtained, and finally he entered the episcopate as Bishop of Lodève, whence he was transferred to the see of Meaux, an important town in Brie, nearly thirty miles eastward of Paris, of which Bossuet was, at a later day, bishop. Briçonnet was a man of considerable learning, of singular fondness for the subtleties of a refined mysticism, and of a kind and gentle temper. While at Rome, whither he went as royal embassador just before entering upon his duties as Bishop of Meaux, he had become more and more convinced of the thorough reform which was needed throughout the whole Church. His first acts in his diocese were those of a reformer. He called upon the ecclesiastics who, neglecting their charges, had been in the habit of spending their time in pleasure at the capital, to return to their pastoral duties. He took steps to initiate a reformation of manners and morals among the clergy. He forbade the Franciscan monks to enter the pulpits of the churches under his supervision. He invited from Paris that remarkable man, Jacques Lefèvre, of Etaples, in Picardy.

Lefèvre was in himself a host. He well deserved the name of the forerunner of the Reformation; for in 1512, five years before Luther posted his theses on the doors of the cathedral at Wittemberg, he published his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which clearly proclaimed the insufficiency of works, and the necessity of faith, as the ground of justification for the sinner. Born in comparative insignificance, he

had raised himself, by his talents and industry, to the very first rank among the instructors of the great Parisian University, whose halls were frequented, as the Venetian embassador, Marino Giustiniano informed the doge and senate, a few years later, by twenty-five thousand scholars coming from every part of Christendom.* Equally distinguished as a mathematician, as an astronomer, as a critic and biblical student, he had, even while superstitiously rigid in his observance of the prescribed fasts of the Roman Church, and glad to deck the shrines of the saints with flowers, seen, with a prophet's eye, the coming reformation; and his pupil, Farel, reports his significant utterance: "William, the world will be renewed, and you will see it!" But Lefèvre had begun to emerge from his blind devotion to the rites of a corrupt Church, and had turned his vigorous mind to the investigation of matter more closely connected with the Scriptures. He had applied a sound criticism to the traditional accounts of the chief persons spoken of in the New Testament, and had published a treatise to prove that Mary, the sister of Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, and the "woman which was a sinner," were three distinct persons. The Greek Church had always recognized this to be the truth, but the Latin fathers, less skilled in hermeneutics, confounded together the "three Marys," as they were called. The Sorbonne pronounced the doctrine of Lefèvre to be heretical, the Bishop of Paris induced his episcopal brother, Fisher, of Rochester, to write a refutation, and Lefèvre might have fared ill at the hands of the Parliament, which was beginning to proceed against him as a heretic, had not the king, Francis I., been led by his confessor, himself a *moderate* in religion, to forbid any further annoyance of the learned doctor.

Such was the most important man of learning whom Briçonnet invited to his diocese. Then there was the impetuous William Farel, a pupil of Lefèvre, a man whose very name has become a synonym for bold and unflinching courage. Gérard Roussel, another pupil, but of a far more retiring and timid character, was also among those who obeyed the summons to Meaux. Under their supervision the work of reformation rapidly advanced. The pulpits of the diocese, until now

* Relazione di Francia del clarissimo Marino Giustiniano, (A. D. 1535,) in the Relazioni Venete. T. i, p. 149.

rarely entered except for the purpose of calling upon the people to contribute to the wants of the monks, were filled by evangelical clergymen, to whom the people listened with eagerness and amazement; for the Gospel had never been heard from the mouths of their spiritual advisers. Lefèvre the scholar, not only preached, but busied himself in the work of translating the sacred Scriptures into the vernacular, that the people might possess and understand it for themselves. First he published the four Gospels, (1523,) and a few months later the remainder of the New Testament. The effect of the dissemination of this version of the word of God, which formed the basis for the subsequent translation of Robert Olivetanus, so important in the history of the progress of Protestantism in France, was at once visible. The copies were eagerly sought; the poor received the Gospel gratuitously when they could not pay even the small sum demanded, from the liberality of the good bishop. Briçonnet introduced the French Scriptures into the churches of Meaux, where the people listened to the lessons in an intelligible language and were delighted. An autograph letter, recently discovered among the rich treasures of the public library of Geneva, from Lefèvre to his absent pupil, Farel, pictures to us the immediate results of the publication, and the glowing hopes of the reformer. He writes:

> Good God, with what joy do I exult when I perceive that the grace of the pure knowledge of Christ has already spread over a good part of Europe; and I hope that Christ is at length about to visit our France with this benediction. You can scarcely imagine with what ardor God is moving the minds of the simple in some places to embrace his Word since the books of the New Testament have been published in French; but you will justly lament that they have not been more widely scattered among the people. Some enemies have endeavored, under cover of the authority of the Parliament, to hinder the work; but our most generous king has become in this matter the defender of the cause of Christ, declaring it to be his will that his kingdom shall hear the word of God without impediment in that tongue which it understands. Now throughout our entire diocese, on feast-days and especially on Sunday, both the Epistle and the Gospel are read to the people in their native tongue, and the parish priest adds a word of exhortation to the Epistle or Gospel, or both at his own discretion.*

* Letter of Lefèvre, dated Meaux, July 6, 1524, in the Bulletin de la Société de l'Historie du Protestantisme Français. T. xi, (1862,) pp. 212, 213.

While Briçonnet was forwarding the cause of the Reformation by helping Lefèvre to publish and disseminate the Scriptures, he strove to accomplish much by personal efforts. It was while preaching to the people on one occasion that he is said to have uttered a prophetic warning to his hearers: "Even should I, your bishop, change my voice and teaching, beware that you change not with me."

But the bright prospect opening before the eyes of French reformers was destined soon to be turned into cloud and darkness. The monks whom Briçonnet had offended proved themselves terrible antagonists. They called upon the Parisian University and Parliament to interpose; and the bishop, who at first had given tokens of courage, and had ventured to denounce the doctors of theology as Pharisees and false prophets, at length wavered and trembled before the storm he had raised. Three years (1523–1525) witnessed the gradual but sure progress of his apostasy from the profession of his convictions. Beginning with the mere withdrawal of his permission accorded to "the evangelical doctors," as they were called, to preach within his diocese, he ended by presiding over a synod of his own clergy, in which the reading of the works of Luther was prohibited upon pain of excommunication, and by giving a public sanction to the abuses against which he had so loudly protested. The rapid advance of his conformity with the requisitions of the Papal Church was doubtless owing not a little to fresh complaints against his orthodoxy, and a summons to appear before an inquisitorial commission appointed by the Parliament, which, however, he succeeded in satisfying in respect to his future, if not as to his past course.

Meanwhile, although himself the instrument of persecution in the hands of the fanatical portion of the French clergy,* it is probable that Briçonnet still retained his early sentiments. Such, at least, was the belief of the reformers, who pointed to

* The cotemporary chronicle recently published by the French Historical Society, under the title of "*Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, sous le règne de François Ier*, (p. 284,) under date of April 14, 1526, records the sentence of a poor wool-carder of Meaux, who, for having denied the efficacy of holy water, the utility of prayers for the dead, the propriety of worshiping images, etc., was condemned to seven years' imprisonment in the prisons of the Bishop of Meaux, and to be fed on bread and water.

him as to a signal instance of the fatal results of tampering with the truth, and attempting to reconcile an inward conviction of the truth with an external conformity with erroneous practices. Nor need we wonder at the solemn earnestness with which they employed this example of worse than Nicodemite timidity, to deter the feeble among the early confessors of a purer Christianity from so pernicious and soul-destroying a delusion as that which had involved Briçonnet in ruin. It is true that the "evangelical doctors" of Meaux, who, at the prelate's invitation, had come to preach the Gospel in his episcopal residence, although dispersed, were not all silent. The weakness that denied Farel a shelter in the vicinity of Paris was the occasion of his going back to preach in his native Dauphiny, and then carrying the word of life to Montbelliard, and to Neufchâtel, Geneva, and so many other towns in French Switzerland. Nor did the common people of Meaux and its vicinity, who had been brought to a knowledge of the truth by the instrumentality of the bishop, share in the cowardly denial of that truth. Obedient rather to his own exhortation addressed to them when nothing seemed less likely to be realized than a prognostication of his fall, while "he changed his voice and teaching," they had obtained too strong a faith in the truths proclaimed to them not to "refuse to change with him." And yet the cause of Protestantism in France was deprived of a spectacle which it needed in that period of its infancy, of a man of high rank in Church and State, and possessing the intimacy and confidence of the king and of his sister Margaret, at a later date Queen of Navarre, forsaking all these advantages and exposing himself, not to mere persecution, but to a martyr's death in attestation of his faith. What might not have been the beneficial results for France, it has been well remarked, of the death at the stake of a Bishop of Lodève and Meaux, Count of Montbrun, and successful negotiator for the king of France? But while thousands of poor wool-carders and other despised artisans sealed their confession with their blood, this titled prelate preferred to vail his true sentiments under a hypocritical conformity, and the cause of Protestantism throughout the world has felt the disastrous results of his sad want of resolution up to the present day.

While Bishop Briçonnet furnishes us an instance of a Nicode-

mite timidity, amounting in effect to absolute apostasy, the history of two of his assistants at Meaux presents to us a less distinct, and therefore perhaps more dangerous type of the same delusion. The aged Lefèvre, the forerunner of the Reformation, like him who came to herald the coming of our Saviour, was by no means "a reed shaken by the wind," and yet he lacked the inflexible courage of the Baptist. His contemplative soul was wearied with the continuous conflicts in which the determined athlete must engage. Rescued from his persecutors, as a learned man, by the interposition of Francis I., he obtained the quiet post of librarian of the royal collection of books at the castle of Blois, on the Loire. Even here we find him "somewhat annoyed" by his enemies, as Queen Margaret of Navarre informs us in one of her letters, which Prof. Génin has printed from the original in the Imperial Library;* and she readily obtained permission to take the venerable doctor with her to Nérac, where, cherished and loved by the king of Navarre and herself, he passed away the few remaining years of his pilgrimage. His mind was, however, not at rest even in these unmolested retreats. An affecting incident is told of his last hours. While sitting at the royal table, a few days before his death, Lefèvre was observed to weep, whereupon Queen Margaret complained of the sadness of one whose society she had sought for her own diversion, and asked the occasion of his sorrow. "How can I minister to the joy of others, who am myself the greatest sinner upon earth?" was Lefèvre's mournful and unexpected response. Pressed to explain himself, the old man, after admitting that through a long life he had maintained exemplary morality of conduct, exclaimed in words frequently interrupted by sobs: "How shall I be able to stand at God's tribunal, who have taught others the purity of the Gospel? Thousands have suffered and died in defense of the doctrine in which I instructed them; and I, unfaithful shepherd that I am, after reaching so advanced an age, when I ought to love nothing less than life, or rather to desire death, have basely avoided the martyr's crown, and betrayed the cause of my God!" The queen and the other persons who were present administered such consolation to the pious Lefèvre as they could find, and

* Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême. T. i, pp. 279, 280.

shortly afterward he died, relying on the forgiveness of his Maker, leaving his library to his disciple, Gérard Roussel, and the rest of his scanty property to the poor. The truth of this story, which rests upon the authority of Hubert Thomas, counselor of state and secretary of the elector palatine, has been discredited by Bayle in his Critical Dictionary, and after him by Tabaraud in the Biographie Universelle, and more lately by Haag, in his great work on French-Protestant Biography. All rest their rejection of the story chiefly upon the entire silence of the reformers, who might well be expected to notice so suggestive an occurrence, were it indeed authentic. But in this instance, as in so many others, it has been proved how unreliable are all such arguments. With singular good fortune, M. Jules Bonnet has, within a few months, discovered among the unexplored treasures of the Genevese public library a minute, in the handwriting of the reformer Farel, which demonstrates the truth of the circumstances described by Hubert Thomas. He writes:

Our master, Jacques Lefèvre, of Etaples, when suffering from the disease by which he died, was for some days so greatly terrified by the judgment of God that he cried out that his fate was sealed, saying that he was eternally lost, because he had not openly professed the truth of God. This complaint he continued to utter day and night. When Gérard Roussel admonished him to be of good courage and trust in Christ, he answered, "I am condemned; I have concealed the truth which I ought to have professed and openly borne witness to." It was a fearful sight to see so pious an old man so distressed in mind and overwhelmed by so great a dread of the judgment of God. At length, however, freed from his fears, he began to entertain a good hope in Christ.*

The faithful and intrepid reformer of Neufchatel was no sooner informed of the gloom that had attended the last hours of his former master than he wrote, as he tells us, to one of those who with him had once sat at the feet of the sage of

* "Jacobus Faber Stapulensis noster, laborans morbo quo decessit, per aliquot dies ita perterritus fuit judicio Dei, ut actum de se vociferaret, dicens se æternum periisse, quod veritatem Dei non aperte professus fuerit, idque dies noctesque vociferando querebatur; et cum a Gerardo Rufo admoneretur ut bono esset animo, Christo quoque fideret, is respondit: Nos damnati sumus, veritatem celavimus quam profiteri et testari palam debebamus. Horrendum erat tam pium senem ita angi animo et tanto horrore judicii Dei conceptí; licet tandem liberatus bene sperrare cœperit ac perrexerit de Christo."—Published for the first time in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français.* T. xi, (1862,) pp. 214, 215.

Etaples. This was Michael d'Arande, who, although a Protestant at heart, had remained in the Roman Church, and was now Bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, in Dauphiny. What Farel would write under such circumstances we may easily infer from our knowledge of the character and history of that faithful servant of God, although he thought it important only to preserve the reply of the bishop to his admonitory letter. The Bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux begins with a picture of the terror which the reading of Farel's announcement of Lefèvre's death had wrought on his entire inner man. He acknowledges that he hears the voice of Jesus Christ himself exhorting him to courage, so justly that he can answer nothing, but must own himself altogether guilty. And the poor man, a bishop of an important diocese, closes by solemnly adjuring the exile and reformer, by the same Lord Jesus, to help him by continual prayer on his behalf, and meanwhile not to desist from ever soliciting him by exhortations, in order that at length he may be able to extricate himself from the deep mire, in which he finds no firm foundation on which his foot may rest. And then, as if remembering that there was danger in committing to paper the record of his internal disquietude, the prelate concludes with the remark that the bearer will give him other details, and will salute him in the name of that Being without whose assistance all effort is of no avail.* Such a letter depicts, more plainly than could any mere description, the fearful abyss of doubt, remorse, and conscious weakness into which many a well-disposed, but irresolute man plunged, and remained in a life-long misery, continually hoping and praying that the Almighty, by some extraordinary interposition, could impart the necessary strength and courage to enable the poor victim to rescue himself. It was more in

* We extract the greater part of this remarkable epistle: "Vix puto transitum pii illius senis Stapulensis tam vehementer animum tuum percellisse quam me totum perterruerunt literæ tuæ et piæ et Christianæ, dum eas lectitarem, non solum stilo quodam humano, sed gladio etiam Spiritus spiritum atque animam proscindentes ac pertrahentes, præsertim cum depingunt mihi ac proponunt Christum Jesum ita me confortantem ac mecum tam juste expostulantem, ut nihil omnino mihi relinquatur aliud quod opponam nisi quod me modis omnibus rerum ac convictum illi dedam. Quare ne te diutius impediam, rogo te atque obtestor per eumdem Dominum nostrum Jesum ut me continuis vestris precibus adjuvetis, atque interim vestris exhortationibus semper sollicitare non desistatis, *quo tandem ex hoc profundo* limo in quo non est substantia erigi queam."

sadness and pity than in anger that those undaunted men who had sacrificed native land, possessions, the prospect of preferment in Church and State, even the security of life itself, and had acquired nerve by the sacrifice, looked upon such instances of pusillanimity.

It must not be supposed, however, that the Nicodemites, in refusing to come forth boldly as the advocates of the new doctrines, and thus to become exposed to the fury of persecution, resigned themselves with a blind devotion to all the abuses which were rife in the papal Church. On the contrary, many of those who assumed this character were distinguished for the incipient reforms which they nurtured in their neighborhood, and not infrequently they were thus the instruments of accomplishing much good. But by the inconsistent course which they adopted, while they alienated the affections of the decided Protestants, they no less surely forfeited the confidence of the opposite party, who refused to view them as other than disguised enemies. Such was the case with Gérard Roussel, Rufi, or Rufus, to whom we have already referred as one of the most prominent among Lefèvre's disciples. Gérard Roussel, a fine scholar and preacher, after having entered into orders, had been invited to Meaux, where the bishop had made him canon and treasurer of the cathedral. When the more decided reformers had found themselves obliged to leave Meaux, in order to enjoy the privilege of expressing their views openly, Roussel remained; for we find in a document recently discovered in the archives of the Roman Catholic Seminary of that city,* that as late as the early months of 1525 he was accused before the chapter of possessing papers containing matters defamatory of the pope, from which a placard had been concocted and posted upon the walls of the church. At the same time he was called to account for neglecting to repeat the Ave Maria in the service, to the great scandal of the people. In his defense, Roussel maintained that the Lord's Prayer was quite as efficacious as the "angelic salutation" on which so much stress was laid, and that the bishop alone was competent to reprove him if he had offended. When, however, Briçonnet had completed his renunciation of the reforms which he had

* Printed in the Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français. T. x, (1861,) pp. 219–221.

himself inaugurated, Gérard Roussel found it necessary to abandon the neighborhood of Paris; and we hear of him, a little subsequently, within the dominions of the king and queen of Navarre, whose chaplain he became. Seven or eight years later, indeed, when the disposition of Francis I. seems temporarily favorable, he is one of the "evangelical preachers," in company with Courault and Berthault, whom Margaret brings to Paris, to preach lenten discourses in the churches of the capital before the king and court. But the attempt to convert the court failed, and Roussel returned to Navarre. The queen made him successively Abbot of Clairac and Bishop of Oléron. The latter of these dignities he retained until his death. In his own diocese he set the example of a faithful shepherd. Contrasting his piety with the worldliness of the majority of the French bishops of that age, even that apostate and bitter enemy of the Reformation, Florimond de Remond, is compelled to admit that his life was apparently one of unusual sanctity. The pack of dogs and hounds was superseded by a host of poor; his horses and brilliant attendants by a troop of children whom he supported while they pursued their studies.* Yet the malice of the monks, whose licentiousness and covetousness he severely reprimanded, was not disarmed by the purity of his morals and life. Gérard Roussel fell a victim to the fanaticism of one De Maytie, who, entering a church in which the eloquent bishop was declaiming against the excessive multiplication of feast days, drew from beneath his mantle an ax, which he had brought with him for the purpose, and overthrew the pulpit. Roussel soon afterward died from the effects of his fall, expressing, it is said, upon his death-bed the same regrets which had disquieted that of his master Lefèvre; nor is the statement unworthy of credit. His murderer, on the other hand, was acquitted by the parliament of Bordeaux, before which he had been arraigned,† on the ground that the act which occasioned the death of so dangerous a

* Porro quia Rufus ille singularis alicujus sanctitatis speciem in moribus et vitâ externa præ se ferebat, ut qui loco canum et vertagorum, pauperum catenam; et pro equis ac satellitio, multos pueros et literarum studiis destinatos aleret, etc.—Florimond de Remond, Historia de ortu, progressu, et ruina hæreseon, l. vii, c. 3, Lat. ed. of Cologne, 1614.

† Haag, La France Protestante, s. v. Gérard Roussel; Gaillard, Histoire de François Ier. T. vi, p. 418.

heretic as the Bishop of Oléron, if not meritorious, was at most a venial offense.

In the case of Gérard Roussel, as in that of most of the other representatives of this class, there is so little of true candor and so much dissimulation, so little bold reformatory zeal and so much mysticism,* that abundant room has been left for discussion as to the position which ought to be assigned to him in the world-wide conflict of the sixteenth century. M. Tabaraud, in the Biographie Universelle, maintained, from a Roman Catholic point of view, his substantial orthodoxy; while the vast majority of Protestant writers claim him as a sincere but timid adherent of the Reformation. This diversity of opinion in itself demonstrates the falseness of his position. Yet we cannot doubt that he was at heart an enemy of the system to which an excess of worldly prudence led him to conform in many particulars. That such was the opinion of the great French and Swiss reformers is evident from the fact, for which Florimond de Remond vouches,† that it was against him especially that Calvin directed his work against the Nicodemites. And the same unfriendly authority calls Roussel the first person clothed in a Catholic habit who, in opposition to the consent of the Church in all ages, publicly gave the eucharist under both forms to communicants. He tells us that Roussel, in order to attract the people, generally employed the vulgar tongue in his prayers; and he confirms his proofs of the heterodoxy of the bishop, by relating that his vicar, a man of the same stamp, as soon as his superior was killed, "threw aside the cowl, married a wife, and became a minister of the Gospel."

We ought here to delineate the course of that worthy patron of the learned and defender of the oppressed, Queen Margaret of Navarre herself; but to give even a sketch of her life would occupy far greater space than we can afford at present. Her eventful career constitutes a subject well worthy of separate treatment; the contrasts and inconsistencies of her character are too marked to be treated satisfactorily within the compass of a few lines. A woman whose purity of life placed her above reproach or suspicion, she was yet the author of tales whose

* Prof. Schmidt, the eminent historian and theologian of Strasburg, has made Roussel, as the type of the mystics, the subject of an able monograph.

† Historia de ortu, progressu, et ruina hæreseon, l. c.

tone can only be excused in consideration of the license of the age and court in which she lived. One of the earliest friends of the Reformation, which she furthered by the composition of her "Mirror of a Sinful Soul" not less than by her intercession on behalf of its professors, she never completely renounced her connection with the Roman Church; and, if we could credit the statements of that gossippy writer Brantôme, practiced superstitious rites even in her old age. Meanwhile, we know that she gave an asylum and entertainment in her court to some of the most dangerous of the sect of the Libertines, whose pestilent doctrines had infected so many liberal minds in France and the Low Countries. Indignant at an attack upon them which seemed to reflect upon herself, she signified to the Genevese reformer her dissatisfaction with his course, whereupon he answered in the courtly and yet faithful letter of April 28, 1545,* a single sentence of which sufficiently justifies his motives: "A dog barks when he sees his master assailed; I should be a very coward, if, seeing the truth of God thus attacked, I were mute and spoke not a word."

We have already referred to the Latin treatise against the Nicodemites, in the shape of two letters, the second of which is addressed to Gérard Roussel, published by Calvin for the first time in 1537.† But the temptations to dissimulation were so strong, and there were so many that fell victims to the snares which were laid in France for those who were timid, that the same writer deemed it advisable, fifteen years later, to collect and publish in the French language four popular discourses which he had delivered at Geneva, under the title of "Four Sermons treating of Matters very useful for our Times." A perusal of this treatise, while it will convince any reader of its appropriateness to meet the end which the author has in view, will also reveal the difficulties encountered by the timid disciple in France, and the subterfuges which suggested themselves as furnishing a ready means for their avoidance. In the first sermon, from the text, "Their drink offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their names into my lips," (Psa. xvi, 4,)

* Lettres Françaises de Calvin, recueillies par Jules Bonnet. T. i, p. 111 *seq.*

† Epistolæ duæ: prima de fugiendis impiorum illicitis sacris et puritate Christianæ religionis; secunda de Christiani hominis officio in sacerdotiis papalis ecclesiæ vel administrandis vel abjiciendis.

the reformer enjoined the partakers of the same blessed faith with himself to flee from all external idolatry. He exhibited in clearest terms the guilt of those who consented to the mass under the pretext that it is but a disguise of the Lord's supper, by comparing it to the calves which Jeroboam set up at Dan and Bethel, in the name of the Lord who had brought Israel up out from Egypt. He answered those who excused themselves on the ground that the magistrates alone had the power to reform what was corrupt, by insisting that the private individual is responsible for the purity of his own body and soul, not for that of the streets and temples. He reproves with deserved severity the hypocrisy of those who, "after attending the mass throughout the year, at Easter seek out some secluded chapel, where a semi-christian monk celebrates for them a bastard supper of the Lord, from which all intention of the adoration of the Host is banished, and where both the bread and the wine are dispensed to all the participants." Some, he tells us, do not avoid the rite of baptism as performed in the churches, because they assert that there is no manifest idolatry connected with it; others go to the churches, but watch their opportunity that they may not be present at the mass, just as if the incense offered to idols, the prayers for the intercession of some saint, and the hymn "Salve Regina," were not quite as blasphemous. The author here pertinently recalls the fact that the very ground on which most of the early Christian martyrs suffered death, was their refusal to offer perfume or incense to idols. And yet to those who still remain in perplexity in respect to their duty, no clearer rule for their guidance can be given than the ample directions of the Word of God. Those who ask more are compared to men who, on being exhorted to modesty of dress and accouterment, would have the preacher cut out their stockings and sew their shoes. In the second sermon, exhorting to the endurance of persecution for Christ's sake and the Gospel's, Calvin enforces his teachings by a memorable example of fortitude. "A young man who lived here with us, having been arrested in the city of Tournay, was condemned to be beheaded if he recanted, and to be burned alive if he persisted in his sentiments. When asked what he wished to do, he simply answered, 'He who will give me grace to die patiently for his name, will doubtless give me grace to endure

the fire.'" The third and fourth sermons exhibit the duty of prizing the privilege of being in the Church of God, and of exposing one's self to toil and privation in order to obtain liberty to worship God purely. To those who refuse to leave a land in which they have no opportunity to worship God as their consciences dictate, under pretext of the duty they owe to their natural prince, there is an easy answer. There is not one of them who would hesitate to abandon his native place if he were in lack of food, or if he could multiply in a foreign land the property he now possesses. The author meets with boldness the objections which avarice and ambition and love of ease raise against forsaking schemes of emolument and preferment, or of undisturbed quiet, and then adds: "It is strange that many think they can shut our mouths if we do not assign them a position and means of living while serving God. 'My condition,' say they, 'is such and such in my country; if I leave it, what will become of me, or how shall I be fed?' As if God had ordained those who preach the Gospel stewards, to give accommodation to all in his states, and to furnish to each, according to his quality, board and wages. . . . The evil is, that they wish to keep their entire possessions, and cannot suffer to be curtailed in honors or riches, nor to be deprived of their ease and delights; that is to say, they cannot bow their neck and bend to bear Jesus Christ."

Such were the attempts of the great Genevese reformer to remove one of the most serious obstacles in the way of the progress of Protestantism in France; that is to say, the reluctance of those who were more or less fully convinced intellectually of the truths of the Gospel, to confess their belief openly and suffer in attestation of it. His zeal was naturally displeasing to those who felt but little inclination to expose themselves to loss of property, honor, and life. Strong objections were raised against the decided position which he had assumed, and the reformer was compelled not only to justify himself in an "Apology," written in 1545—that is, seven years before the publication of the sermons just referred to—but to obtain the opinion of the other reformers of Switzerland and Germany, to whom his opponents had also appealed. His letters to Luther and Melanchthon, and the response of Melanchthon, have been preserved. All breathe a spirit of cordial sympathy

and esteem, in spite of differences on minor points. Bucer, Peter Martyr, and Melanchthon, all coincided in the views respecting the necessity of that open profession of the Gospel on which Calvin insisted. Melanchthon, it is true, made greater concessions than the Genevese reformer approved; but all agreed, as we are informed by Theodore de Bèze, that one cannot serve two masters.* This general unanimity encouraged Calvin to publish the sermons to which we have glanced, as well as to make great private exertion to reclaim individuals of distinction, such as François Daniel and Louis du Chemin, who still refused to forsake their external connection with the Church of Rome. Nor were these labors fruitless, for Theodore de Bèze assures us that "these writings were the cause of great blessing, since many now came to a determination to devote themselves wholly to God, who had hitherto been asleep in their uncleanness."

Art. VI.—OUR ANTIPODES.

The History of New South Wales. With an Account of Van Diemen's Land, [Tasmania,] New Zealand, Port Philip, [Victoria,] Moreton Bay, and other Australian Settlements. Comprising a complete view of the Progress and Prospects of Gold Mining in Australia. The whole Compiled from Official and other Authentic and Original Sources. By Roderick Flanigan, member of the Australian Literary Institute, and of the Philosophical Society of New South Wales. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1862.

The Three Colonies of Australia: New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia; their Pastures, Copper Mines, and Gold Fields. By Samuel Sidney, author of "The Australian Hand-Book," etc. 1 vol. 12mo. New York: C. M. Saxton, Barker & Co. 1860.

Land, Labor, and Gold; or, Two Years in Victoria. With Visits to Sydney and Van Diemen's Land. By William Howitt. 2 vols. 12mo. Boston; Ticknor & Fields. 1855.

British Enterprise Beyond the Seas: or, The Planting of Our Colonies. By J. H. Fyfe, author of "The Triumph of Invention and Discovery." 1 vol. 12mo. London: T. Nelson & Sons. 1863.

* Bèze, Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Réformées de France, (ed. of Lille,) T. i, p. 31. See also Henry, Life of Calvin, ii, pp. 7–11 and App.; and Calvin's Letters, (Eng. ed. of Jules Bonnet,) i, pp. 131 *seq.*, 110–117.

Australia; with Notes by the Way, on Egypt, Ceylon, Bombay, and the Holy Land. By FREDERICK JOBSON, D.D. Second edition revised. 1 vol. 8vo. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. 1862.

Expeditions into the Interior of Eastern Australia; with Descriptions of Australia Felix and New South Wales. By T. L. MITCHELL. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1838.

Tracks of M'Kinlay and Party across Australia. By JOHN DAVIS, one of the Expedition. Edited from Mr. Davis's Manuscript Journal; with an Introductory View of the recent Australian Expedition of M'Douall Stuart, Burke, Wills, Landsborough, etc. By WILLIAM WESTGARTH, author of "Victoria and the Australian Gold Mines," etc. With Maps and Illustrations. 1 vol. 8vo. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1863.

British Sessional Papers. Parliamentary Reports of The Australian Exploring Expedition of Burke and Wills. 1862.

Journal of the Royal Geographical Society. Volume XXXII. London: 1862.

Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. Volumes VI and VII. Sessions of 1861, 1863.

IF we should start from San Diego, near the south-western corner of the United States, and go straight through the center of the earth, provided we safely passed whatever interior floods, granitic obstructions, and central fires intervene, we should "revisit the glimpses of the moon" near the south-westernmost point of the great island-continent of Australia. A journey otherwise than imaginary by this underland route we do not think would be altogether safe or comfortable; but it is a very short passage, and enables one to "define his position" relative to the regions to be visited. The dimensions and shape of the continent isle are not unlike those of our own nationality. Its outline is more regular, and it stretches away from the point designated toward the torrid regions, while the United States extends in the opposite direction. The length of each from east to west is about twenty-five hundred miles, and the breadth from north to south about fifteen hundred. They contain also each nearly three million square miles; the mineral treasures are similar, and the race who occupy and are to occupy both are substantially one. Here all correspondence ceases, and the two territories become as dissimilar in character as they are antipodal in situation. It is summer there when it is winter here, and our day is their night. There "the barometer rises before bad weather and falls before good;" the north is the hot wind and the south the cold; the poorest cottages are ceiled

with cedar, fields are fenced with mahogany, and myrtle-trees are used for firewood; the swans are black and the eagles are white. "The mole lays eggs and has a duck's bill," and "the cherry grows with a stone on the outside."

It is not unlikely that the existence of Australia has been known to the Chinese and other Asiatic nations for many ages. But none of the western nations appear to have had any intelligence of it till after the beginning of the seventeenth century. In 1601 Manuel di Eredia, a Portuguese, made the first authentic report of a discovery of the shores of this continent. Dutch and Spanish navigators subsequently sighted various points on the coast, though often without even suspecting them to have any territorial connection with each other. Up to 1626 a large proportion of the whole ocean border had been discovered, and the name assigned to the territory inclosed was that of the Great South Land. Afterward the Dutch sailors gave it the appellation of New Holland, by which name it was known till within the present century. In 1642 the whole of Australia was circumnavigated by Tasman, who in the course of his voyage discovered New Zealand and what has till recently been known as Van Diemen's Land, but now properly taken the name of Tasmania. The latter, however, was not thought to be separate from Australia till more than a century and a half afterward.

But the expeditions of the Dutch furnished little knowledge of Australia, and to all practical intents it remained unexplored till the English turned their attention to it. A most unfavorable reputation had got abroad in the world respecting this land. Dampier found the coast forbidding, the land barren and thinly inhabited by the "most unpleasant looking and worst featured of any people" he had ever seen. Tasman's Land was declared to be the abode of "howling evil spirits." It is no wonder that, while there was plenty of other islands, where all mineral and vegetable riches abounded, where the natives reveled in tropical luxuriance, and wealth apparently might be had for the gathering, this whole region should have been neglected.

In 1770 Captain Cook in the course of his explorations came to Botany Bay and examined the coast of New South Wales, stretching along for a thousand miles, and took posses-

sion of the territory in the name of his sovereign. But the great navigator's usual good judgment seems to have been wanting when he selected as a place for a future settlement one of the most miserable swamps on the coast, neglecting to examine inlets, to which even the sailors called his attention, leading to some of the finest harbors in the world and the most eligible town sites.

It is not so strange that neither Captain Cook nor his companions were favorably impressed with the appearance of the country, or that the English government should have regarded it as a suitable residence for the vast army of moral incurables, not vicious enough to deserve death, and yet far too bad to live in civilized society. The jails were frightfully overcrowded. The American colonies had become independent, and there was no more opportunity to send to the plantations of Virginia and the Carolinas those interesting subjects who were afterward to develop into the "superior race," against whose rule the northern Roundheads would revolt in vain. It was necessary that some new convict station should be found. In its perplexity the government recollected the thousand miles of sea-coast discovered by Captain Cook on the other side of the world, and it was determined to lay the foundations of a penal colony there.

If the design had been to extemporize a Tartarus, the plan of transportation was better than even the locality chosen; for never were human elements more completely adapted and proportioned for the formation of a social pandemonium than those selected by the first commissioner of transportation. The idea of reformatory discipline was not very seriously thought of, though doubtless there were strong hopes cherished by some influential persons that reformation to a portion of the convicts might be the result. The criminals were gathered miscellaneously without any pretense of selection. There were six hundred men and two hundred and fifty women, the latter being not only the most abandoned of their sex, but many of them aged and infirm, and even idiotic. This great disproportion was not only maintained, but increased, till the females were scarcely a seventh of the population. The results were, of course, deplorable. A military guard of two hundred men and officers accompanied the convicts, but no jailer,

overseer, or superintendent. No schoolmaster was sent; and even a chaplain was not thought of till the last moment. There was no agriculturist to teach his art to men who would so much need it, and whose vocation had been far other than that of farming. Not half a dozen men knew how to use carpenter's tools. There was only one bricklayer, and not a mechanic capable of constructing a corn-mill.

It was in January, 1788, that Captain Phillip arrived in Botany Bay with the first installment of embodied and associated vice. The place was at once found unsuitable for a settlement. Cruising about in search of a better situation, he found, a few miles further north, a narrow opening in the precipitous iron-bound coast. Within was a vast land-locked bay, which at a glance was seen to be a most magnificent harbor. The shores were covered with beautiful groves, while about six miles from the entrance a fine stream of water flowed down into a pleasant cove. Near the mouth of this stream were laid the foundations of what is now the large and populous city of Sydney.

For *such* a colony, however, the spot was far from suitable. A large proportion of the surrounding country was of the most barren character. The only really fertile portions were covered with the heaviest and hardest timber, which the newcomers were incompetent to remove. It was impossible that they could support themselves. Distress and privation beset them almost from their first landing. The rations which they brought with them were soon consumed. Before they had been a year at Sydney there was not four months' provision in the colony, even at half allowance.

Without waiting to hear the success of the experiment, the government dispatched ship after ship laden with prisoners of all degrees of crime. Young lads guilty of petty offenses mingled with male and female convicts of the most abandoned wickedness. The government was of the most despotic character, and grievously mismanaged at that. Of course disorder was very rife, and the convicts held life so cheap that murder would be committed at any time for two or three days' rations. Such was the beginning of what has now become a great, prosperous, and powerful community. The evils were slowly remedied. A system of labor was devised for the convicts,

under which public works were constructed, and the resources of the colony began to be developed. Inducements were held out to free emigrants, it is true, but few were willing to become part of such a society, and those few were not of the most reputable character; but they usually found their profit in it. Much was done from time to time to alleviate the social evils and to prepare the way for the rise of a Christian community. The first administration really adapted to the wants of the settlement was that of Governor Macquarie from 1809 to 1821. He was a man of a rough, arbitrary character, but devoted himself faithfully to the business of his office, and to the good of the colony. But it was only toward the close of his administration that free colonists began to arrive in any considerable numbers at Sydney.

The only great source of wealth to the Australian colonists, previous to the discovery of gold, was in the raising of stock and the growing of wool. It is doubtful, even now, if the mineral treasures of the country, vast as they are, are a greater element of prosperity than the herds and flocks which multiply and thrive so wonderfully in the broad rich pastures of the several colonies. In the transports which brought the first company of settlers there were also brought, among other animals, two bulls and four cows. Whether disgusted with their human associates, or dissatisfied with the want of enterprise in the government, they started on an exploring expedition, in which they made such satisfactory discoveries that they never returned. A few years afterward, by information received from the natives, it was surmised that cattle existed in the wilds beyond the limits of colonial occupation. Search being made, a fine, fat herd of sixty animals was discovered, and by certain peculiarities it was ascertained that they were the offspring of the wanderers. This incident gave a new turn to affairs in the colony. The good sense and discrimination of the cattle in forsaking the barren regions of the coast for capital grazing grounds in the interior, led some of the more enterprising colonists to follow their example. Henceforth stock-raising became an important and lucrative occupation. Probably there is no country in the world where cattle multiply so rapidly and thrive so well as here. Several years afterward a Mr. M'Arthur observed that a great improvement took place in the

fiber of the hairy Bengal and flat-tailed Cape sheep after a brief residence in the colony. It struck him that there were many points of resemblance in soil and climate between Spain and Australia. He accordingly imported a number of the famous Spanish merinoes, who took kindly to the country, and the experiment was found to be surprisingly successful.

The flocks multiplied with a rapidity, if possible, excelling that of the herds. The wool was of the choicest anywhere to be found, and Australia is now the greatest wool-growing country in the world. Once demonstrated to be profitable, many engaged in the business. It became a stimulus to subsidiary occupations, and the colony presented a thriving appearance. Free settlers began to arrive in greater numbers, though still greatly outnumbered by the convict class. Some of these were men of capital and enterprise, others were mere adventurers, and often something worse. It was the saying of blunt old Governor Macquarie some time before this, that "the colony consisted of those who had been transported and those who ought to have been." There was some truth at the bottom of it doubtless, though it was not to be taken as strictly literal.

The colonization of the continent may be said to have kept pace with the discovery of permanent sources of water. Previous to 1820 vigorous efforts at exploration had been rewarded by the discovery of many fine streams, along whose banks were vast plains of richest herbage. Captain Sturt, the most famous of early explorers, discovered the Murumbigee and Darling, and following them down to their junction with the Murray, floated along this, the great river of Australia, to the sea. Near its mouth was found a wide fertile region, which was soon peopled with the overflowing flocks and herds of the older colony. It was subsequently made a colony by itself, under the name of South Australia. Years afterward Major Mitchell, pushing his energetic explorations along the banks of the same great river, left it at a certain point and struck toward the south. He soon came into a land which, from its exuberant fertility, he called Australia Felix. The newly discovered and inviting regions were speedily occupied by straggling settlers from Tasmania, who were soon met by a large stream of emigration from New South Wales. Here began, in 1836, the now most populous and thriving colony of Victoria.

During the previous year the population had been rapidly increasing. Transportation still continued, but there was much opposition to it, and it was finally abolished in 1839. There have been attempts by certain parties at different times to revive it under pretext of furnishing needed laborers in the settlements, and for other reasons, but without success. Some of the convicts conducted themselves reputably, and received their freedom as a reward; others served out their time, and then were free. Many of them became wealthy and influential citizens. One of this class died in 1840, worth two and a half millions of dollars. But, of course, the large proportion, whether emancipates or still held in durance, were of a vicious character. Many, too, of the free settlers were no better. The irregularities of the government, the absence of the social restraints operative in older communities, the small proportion of females, together with the character of the parties above referred to, made the moral condition of the community anything but desirable.

But better elements were continually coming in. Men of education and refinement were found among the population. Schools were established, churches erected, the laws were gradually adapted to the wants of the people, and the civilizing influences of religion, education, systemized industry, commerce, and government produced their usual results.

One noble-minded, philanthropic woman did much to advance the interests of the colonies. We have alluded to the paucity of females in the population, and may easily infer from it some of the numerous ills traceable to this cause. Mrs. Chisholm visiting Sydney with her husband, an officer of the Madras army, on furlough, detected this evil and sought to provide a remedy.

She established a Home in Sydney, where young and friendless women were received on their arrival in the colony, and where emigrants, desiring to proceed inland, obtained information and advice. Finding that there was a demand, not merely for domestic servants, but for wives, among the stock-breeders in the bush, and that many girls were frightened to proceed alone, Mrs. Chisholm collected a party, and herself led them to their destination.

The enterprise was successful. By the end of 1842 she had succeeded in placing comfortably two thousand emigrants of both sexes. She went herself among the interior settlements, from house to house, studying the character of the people, and

adapting her work to the wants of the several classes intended to be benefited. "Shepherds would leave their work, and walk thirty or forty miles to the place where she camped in order to choose a wife, bringing with them certificates of character and their saving-bank books." Mrs. Chisholm afterward visited England and established a system of emigration, in which domestic ties were respected, and by which family groups were transplanted to the other side of the globe.

The land system of Australia is different from that of the United States. It has been one of the great drawbacks on the prosperity of the country. At first all the government lands were disposed of by grant. Officers, civil and military, were furnished with extensive tracts. Free laboring settlers and discharged convicts received smaller grants in proportion to their wants and their means. In time, as the pastoral advantages of the country became evident, and fortunes began to be made from the raising of wool and tallow, the lands were regarded as of more importance. Grants were discontinued, and the public lands were put up at a moderate upset price after survey, and in lots to suit purchasers. But the great wool-growing squatters and capitalists did not like the arrangement, as we shall see, and got it changed for the worse. Vast speculative schemes connected themselves with the new system, and wide-spread disasters ensued.

The settlement of South Australia was concomitant with the formation of one of those immense bubbles which the British people are in the habit of getting up occasionally for their own diversion and the amusement of the rest of mankind. We have the same schemes here in miniature, though perhaps we make up in number what we lack in magnificence. A Mr. Wakefield, who had given some attention to the subject of colonization, came out with a plan for the settlement of the new territory, which he thought vastly superior to anything else, and which appeared plausible to the English mind. It was also very successful on paper. The principal features of this scheme were the fixing of a high upset price on the government lands, and the appropriation of the proceeds of the sales to the securing of free emigration. The object was to form a class of large landholders, to whom there should always be plenty of cheap labor. If a few men who had capital could

buy large tracts, those without capital would be precluded by the high price from obtaining small farms, and thus, by the importation of multitudes of the poorer classes, there would always be abundance of labor at prices so low that there was no danger the laborers would ever become independent proprietors. It was a rule working both ways, and a poor rule at that, always resulting, whichever way it worked, in perpetuating poverty where it existed, and in enriching the rich. Of course, in a new country it was impossible to enforce it wholly, except by such arbitrary and despotic measures as no modern government would dare to adopt. The whole scheme, as looked at from a democratic or American point of view, has the appearance of a piece of impudent injustice. But some of our stolid cousins regarded it as a very nice arrangement, and proceeded to put it in practice. A company was formed with a large capital. By the usual arts it was brought into great public prominence. Large tracts of land were secured. A ship-load of adventurers embarked for Australia; they planted themselves in the wilderness, laid out a city on the banks of a swamp; sent home glowing accounts of the prospects of the colony, received great additions to their number, and went to speculating in town-lots and other real estate. Vast fortunes were made and lost; but no productive business was organized. The people imported all their sustenance and lived on their capital; and when the bubble burst and the appalling crash came, the only elements of society that escaped and were able to succor the suffering were the small farmers, which it had been the policy of the colony to proscribe, and in the way of whose existence every obstacle had been thrown.

There have been great changes in the system of government in the several colonies since the foundation of New South Wales. At first it was a military despotism of the most arbitrary kind. Then the powers of the governor were limited. Then came a council appointed by the crown; afterward modified so as to be partly or wholly elected by the colony; and finally a colonial parliament and a constitution, with the extension of suffrage and substantially the power of self-government. There have been political excitements, social disturbances, riot and insurrection by the convicts, troubles with the natives, financial disaster, and such other experiences as might naturally

be expected in a new country, as well as many that could not have been anticipated. There have been absurd schemes of government, abuses in fixing the relations of labor to capital, much artificial tinkering of social laws which nothing but nature or native good sense is competent to regulate; and deplorable consequences from all these antecedents.

But for all this, the several colonies have grown apace, agriculture and the industrial arts have been developed, sources of wealth unusual and prolific have discovered themselves to such as sought them, an increasing acquaintance with the character of the country has wonderfully improved its reputation; and where the refuse of English jails had at first been emptied, with every prospect of deepening its depravity till the whole mass perished of its own corruption, a great, free, self-supporting community is coming into existence.

There are now five separate colonies in Australia, besides those of New Zealand, Tasmania, and other neighboring islands. New South Wales is the oldest of these, and occupies a large territory in the south-eastern quarter of the continent. Victoria is the smallest in size but the largest in population, owing to the mighty influx of immigration seeking the gold mines, which are principally in its territory. Southern Australia lies next west of Victoria, but extends much further into the interior, and abounds in mineral, agricultural, and pastoral wealth. Western Australia has the largest territory, embracing nearly a million square miles, and is the most sparsely populated and least successful hitherto of all the colonies. Queensland is the youngest of the family, so far as heard from; for in Australia, as in our own country, the march of improvement is so rapid, and the development so swift, that new governments are established without much premonition. The last was separated from New South Wales only four or five years ago. It occupies a large space in the north-eastern part of the continent, extending from Moreton Bay to the Gulf of Carpentaria, and appears to be clearly the most promising portion of the country. There is a likelihood that it may itself soon be divided, and a new colony organized out of its northern district, embracing the peninsula of Cape York. Settlements, too, we believe, have already been made on the north-western coast, where a large rich region will probably be taken from Western Australia and set up for itself.

The colonies together had, in 1860, a population of 1,061,406. It is, of course, much increased by this time. They raise a revenue of more than £6,000,000 annually, and enjoy sufficient credit to have a nucleus of debt to the amount of £10,000,000. Their imports are valued at £26,000,000 a year, and their exports, chiefly gold and wool, at £23,000,000. It is said that, taking the whole of Australia, each colonist has already reclaimed and cultivated twenty acres of land.

The exploration of the Australian interior furnishes a topic of exceeding interest. For twenty-five years after the founding of Sydney, the only known territory of the colony was a few square miles in the vicinity of Port Jackson. Going back from the coast from thirty to fifty miles, one was met everywhere by the impassable barrier of the Blue Mountains. Many perilous and some fatal attempts were made to discover a practicable pass over their craggy sides and among their yawning caverns. We have noted the discovery at last of the long-sought opening, and seen how the sheep and cattle owners pressed through to ovine and bovine paradise of Bathurst Plains.

The spirit of enterprise was now fully aroused, and numerous expeditions succeeded each other, going to the north and west. Cunningham, Leichardt, Strzelecki, Eyre, Sturt, Mitchell, Oxley, Howell, and Hume, are some of the more noted names of heroic pioneers in this important but dangerous work. Almost every expedition, though encountering huge difficulties, brought back news of rich and beautiful lands discovered. Those going north had determined the existence of an immense plateau, situated almost within the tropics, where were boundless waving pastures, perennial streams, and the cooling breezes so long sighed for by the flock-owners of New South Wales. The Darling Downs, Fitzroy Downs, Mantuan Downs, etc., were names designating these "fresh fields and pastures new."

It must be remarked, however, that these early discoveries were not always what they at first promised to be. The rivers of Australia were found to have the most capricious characteristics. They ran inland, away from the ocean instead of toward it. This fact gave rise to conjectures of a vast inland sea, which some apparently authentic reports tended to confirm. But on further investigation, the sea was indiscoverable. Some of the

rivers which, when first seen, appeared competent for all that pertains to the functions of their order, on being traced downward suddenly came to an end, being drunk up by the desert. Others terminated in chains of pools or mud lakes. Some of them were found, to the dismay of the thirsty explorer, to be as salt as the ocean. They not only in these respects violated the usages of all well-behaved rivers, but sometimes, without the least apparent cause, they suddenly overflowed their banks and deluged the contiguous plains, carrying away whole herds and flocks, with their keepers, and such habitations and other products of industry as were in their neighborhood. It was a long time, even in the partially occupied region, before the inhabitants became acquainted with the ways of the gods of this new strange land.

With the exception of nautical surveys along the coast, all the explorations and discoveries, previous to 1840, were confined to the south-eastern section of Australia, comprising perhaps less than one sixth of the whole island-continent. The interior was still a great mysterious unknown, to which fancy attributed a dubious and rather unearthly character. It was full of perils, and impenetrable to any but braver or better furnished men than had yet appeared in the colonies. But the spirit of adventure was by this time pretty thoroughly aroused, and the desire to penetrate the interior and to possess its secrets, was becoming more intense.

In 1844 Captain Sturt, whose former efforts we have seen crowned with the most profitable results, organized an expedition to seek the center. It consisted of sixteen men, with the requisite animals, provisions, and implements. He went from Adelaide, taking the eastern side of Lake Torrens, and passing up the Murray and Darling rivers. Leaving the latter at its junction with what is now known as the Menindie, he struck off toward the north. The country soon began to assume an inhospitable appearance. The party toiled painfully across a hot sandy desert. "The iron yokes of the bullocks became so hot that they could not be placed on the animals for fear of burning them. When a breeze sprang up, it felt like the scorching blaze of a mighty furnace." But this direful desert had its limits, or, at least, its interruptions. They reached a well watered, fertile, and picturesque spot, which was named Rocky Glen. They stopped a few days to recruit the men and horses. In the mean time, Sturt explored the country beyond,

to ascertain the best northern route. He soon found there was no such route; the country beyond was an absolute desert. The increasing heat was drying up the water and herbage in the vicinity; and already their retreat was cut off, as the streams and pools in their rear had utterly disappeared.

They were imprisoned in Rocky Glen for six months. Not a drop of rain fell all this time, and none had fallen for two months before. The heat was so intense that they were obliged to excavate an underground chamber to screen them from its power. The pool was drying up; vegetation "became mere snuff;" scurvy attacked the party; and one man, the second in command, was dying, indeed did die soon after relief came. But just in the last extremity rain fell. It enabled the party to proceed. About fifty miles further on an eligible halting-place was found. From this, two sustained efforts were made to reach the center. The first was in a north-west direction. Crossing a dark green plain of samphire bushes, dotted with the dry beds of small salt lagoons of sparkling white, they next encountered a series of ridges of a fiery red color, rising one after another like gigantic waves, "on the summit of which the sand lay like crests of snowy foam." These parallel ridges, fifty or sixty feet high, and appearing together like a suddenly congealed ocean, are characteristic of considerable spaces in the interior of Australia.

Beyond, there lay an immense stony desert. "Neither herb nor shrub protruded through the firmly-wedged quartz fragments, . . . and the dray-wheels and hoofs of the horses left not the least impression on the plain. All that could attract or sustain animal and vegetable life Nature seems to have rigidly excluded from this scene of desolation." After this came a wide earthy plain, on the surface of which there was no vegetation, and not even a stone. Its appearance, as described by Sturt, was that of "a boundless plowed field, on which floods had settled and subsided." This gave place to the succession of tall sand ridges again. Men and horses were nearly exhausted, when, a little further on, they came to Eyre's Creek, which afforded good water and grass for the horses. Beyond this they found the same dreary deserts stretching before them. Both men and horses were too weak to proceed further. They were four hundred miles from their last depot, and no reliable

water on the way, except Eyre's Creek, fifty miles in their rear. But they made good their retreat.

Starting again, he took a route further to the west, hoping to avoid the stony desert, the mud plains, and dismal ridges. After seven days' travel he came upon the banks of a fine flowing stream, watering an extensive tract of pastoral country, now known as Cooper's Creek, recently associated with the melancholy fate of Burke and Wills, the first that passed through the interior from ocean to ocean. Beyond this, however, recurred the adamantine desert and the inhospitable plains he was so anxious to avoid. Again baffled, he reluctantly retreated. He had gained some important information useful to future explorers, though from its partial nature calculated to produce wrong impressions. It cost much labor and suffering, as indeed have all the valuable explorations of the continent. Sturt's furthest point was about one hundred and fifty miles from the center.

The same year in which Sturt was making his perilous journey, an important expedition was undertaken by Dr. Leichardt from Moreton Bay to Port Essington, on the Gulf of Carpentaria. This expedition, though adding nothing to the knowledge of the interior, was valuable in its results. The party went three thousand miles, experiencing the usual vicissitudes of explorers, passing through hot deserts, almost dying of thirst, encountering wildernesses of scrub and rough, rocky mountain ranges, attacked by savages who killed one of the party and wounded others, almost famishing for want of food, but at last, when ready to perish, reaching the colony on the further coast. They had discovered large reaches of fertile and fruitful territory, well wooded and watered, comprising some of the most delightful and salubrious regions in the world, and capable of supporting an immense population.

The gallant leader of this expedition soon after undertook another more formidable enterprise, namely, an attempt to cross the continent from east to west. He plunged into the interior wilds more than sixteen years ago, and has never been heard from since. His fate is one of the mysteries of that mysterious region, which may never be solved.

The fatal disaster resulting to so many of the explorers, and the pitiless perils to which all were subject, together with the

unpromising account brought from the interior by Sturt and others, gave a check to the enthusiasm for inland explorations. Little more was done in this direction till 1860. We ought doubtless to except Mr. Gregory's Victoria River * Expedition on the north-west coast in 1855. Following this important river up to its source as far as latitude 18° 12′, Mr. Gregory found himself on the summit of a dividing range similar to that near the east coast. Proceeding down the inland slope, he passed through a desolate tract, but came upon a stream flowing toward the interior. On its banks for a hundred miles the land "consisted of vast plains of rich soil covered with beautiful grass." After this the country deteriorated till the stream terminated in a chain of dry salt lakes, beyond which was an impassable desert. Turning his course to the east, he crossed over to Gulf Carpentaria, and thence by Leichardt's old route to Sydney. Gregory went as far as 20° 16′ south latitude, and stopped about as far short of the center on the north as Sturt did on the south. Mr. F. T. Gregory, a brother of the above, has recently made another expedition from a point on the coast about midway between the mouth of Victoria River and Swan River. In this expedition he discovered immense regions of valuable territory, some of which by this time is doubtless being occupied by a thriving new colony.

Within the last four years the work of exploration has gone forward with extraordinary vigor. It is true, the former heroic efforts had so nearly effected the solution of the territorial problem, that less enterprise and endurance than had been manifested in them were requisite to prove their exceeding value. In 1860 Mr. M'Douall Stuart, who had been a companion of Sturt in his search for the center, and had also, with two attendants, laid open a region to the north of Spencer's Gulf, comprising eighteen hundred square miles of valuable territory well supplied with water and covered with luxuriant vegetation, started from Adelaide to go directly across the continent. He pursued a route from Chambers's Creek to the west of that of Sturt. The country as he went on was found to be for the most part very fine. There were ranges

* This is not to be confounded with the Victoria River of Mitchell and others in the south-eastern interior.

of hills with grass growing on their sides and abounding in springs of water, and plains fertile and well watered. A journey of six weeks, with comparatively few hardships, brought him to the long coveted center. The occasion was celebrated by planting a flag on an elevation close by, which was named Central Mount Stuart.

Beyond the center the old difficulties recurred. Dense belts of scrub and a scarcity of water drove them back three times. A new course was tried, but in this they were met by hostile savages and obliged to retire. Stuart's extreme northern point was 18° 47′. It will be recollected that Gregory, coming from the north, had reached lat. 20° 16′, so that they had overlapped each other by a degree and a half. It is not improbable that the tracks of the two explorers came within a short distance of each other, even if they did not intersect. The continent was practically crossed, though not from one direction. Nothing daunted, Mr. Stuart the next year made another attempt to get through to the northern coast. This time he had reached within ninety miles of the northern coast.

A third time, and immediately after his second return, he went over the same now familiar ground, and after many efforts he succeeded, by a detour sixty miles to the west, in forcing a passage through the scrub. It brought him into an interesting country. There were plains covered with luxuriant grass, "often reaching above the shoulders of the men," a picturesque diversity of hill and dale, woodland and river, a profuse tropical vegetation upon a rich deep soil. Through this he emerged on the coast of the great Indian Sea.

But before this the great problem of a central route had been solved by the expedition of Burke and Wills, which terminated so disastrously and fatally. It was organized at Melbourne in the latter part of 1860. There were five explorers, with ten European and three Sepoy attendants, and twenty-seven camels, with horses and wagons. There was a difficulty between the leader and some of his subordinates soon after starting, which led to the return of the latter. At Menindie Creek the company was divided: one party remaining with a part of the camels and stores to come on afterward; and the other going on to Cooper's Creek, the furthest eligible inland station. Having rested here and made all due preparation,

and leaving Mr. Brahe and a part of the advance division of the expedition in camp, with a depot of stores, to wait the coming up of the rear division, Mr. Burke, Mr. Wills, and two men, King and Gray, with six camels and one horse, and three months' provision, went on toward the north. This was on the 16th of December, 1860. They appear to have made their way meeting with the usual difficulties, but undergoing no extraordinary trials for six or seven weeks, when they reached the valley of the Clancary or Flinders, following down which they were conducted through much rich country to the marshes bordering on the Gulf of Carpentaria. The journals kept by the leaders of the expedition were necessarily imperfect, being only memoranda in many places from which they alone could have recalled the full account of their discoveries. They had left their camels and horse twenty-five miles from the mouth of the Flinders, and walked down till they reached a salt marsh, crossing which they came to a channel full of sea-water, and then moved "slowly down three miles to camp." It is hardly probable that they saw the open sea, but it is fully evident that they were in its immediate vicinity.

They lost one of the men, Gray, and some of the camels. They returned by the same route to their depot at Cooper's Creek after an absence of four months and five days. They had only two camels left. Their sole remaining provision was a pound and a half of dried meat. Nearly famished and almost utterly exhausted, to their amazement they found the camp deserted! For some unaccountable reason the reserve party at Menindie had not come up. Brahe, hearing nothing from either section of the expedition, had determined to retreat. What makes it the more aggravating, in this as in two other instances which we shall note, the connections only failed by a slight interval. On opening the cache they found provisions, and a note informing them that Brahe had left only seven hours before! Then came a series of other errors strangely and fatally coincident. After resting four or five days they closed up the cache, leaving in it a note for any of the other party who might afterward return; but they neglected to leave any outward mark to indicate the fact! Then, instead of going down the route by which they had come from Menindie, they struck out in a new direction. Had they gone

down the old track they would have met the reserve party coming up.

The latter party arrived in the camp, but by the same fatality did not open the cache, and so learned nothing of the whereabouts and condition of the leaders. The latter broke down after a few days from sheer exhaustion. Both their camels died. Discouraged from continuing the attempt to get through to South Australia, just when they were perhaps within fifty miles of the settlements, and more than that from Cooper's Creek, they crept back to the latter place. They were utterly worn out. First Burke, then Wills died, and King was left alone in the wilderness. He was fortunate enough, however, to attract the sympathy of the natives, among whom he managed to subsist till rescued by the relief partly sent out under Mr. Howitt.

When the uncertainty occasioned by the long-continued absence of these explorers deepened into anxiety, and the anxiety became painful, earnest efforts were made in the several colonies to ascertain their fate or afford them relief. Three expeditions were dispatched in 1861 in search of the missing party. That under Mr. A. W. Howitt was successful in discovering the disastrous results of the former enterprise. Mr. Howitt found King among the Cooper's Creek natives, and from him learned the whole interesting, but melancholy story. He also recovered the remains of the leaders and returned with them to the colony.

Mr. Landsborough and a well-equipped party were sent round by water to the Gulf of Carpentaria to make an exploration from the north. At the same time a company, under Mr. Walker, was to proceed from Rockingham Bay, on the east coast, to cross the head of the gulf. Landsborough's party was conveyed in a little brig up the Albert River about twenty miles, where a depot was formed. Following their instructions, they proceeded south-westerly toward Stuart's Central Mount. They succeeded in attaining a distance of two hundred miles from the coast, and had passed through what was on the whole a promising country, well deserving the name previously given to one of its districts, "The Plains of Promise," but they were compelled to retire by the "threatening aspect of the natives."

At the depot on the Albert, Landsborough found that

Walker had safely arrived from the east coast, bringing intelligence that he had come upon the tracks of Burke's party at the River Flinders. Landsborough immediately adopted a new course. Going up the Flinders, which he estimated to be five hundred miles long, he crossed a low dividing range, and a journey of about twenty miles brought him to the headwaters of the Thompson, flowing southerly. On this stream they found that some colonists from Queensland had already preceded them in search of pastoral stations. Hence they made their way to the Barcoo, but were diverted by the drouth prevailing at the south-west from pushing through to Victoria, and so went by the way of the Darling and New South Wales.

M'Kinlay left Adelaide in August, 1861. He went in a northerly direction, and was six weeks in getting beyond the furthest settlements of the colony, which now extended four hundred miles into the interior. Beyond these he found some reaches of arid desert; but a very large proportion of the country passed through abounded in streams and sheets of water, and was clothed with luxuriant grass. It is probable that in other seasons of the year, and indeed at the same season in other years, it may present a less promising appearance. After this they traversed Stur's stony desert, now considerably contracted in the dimensions assigned to it in former reports, and emerged again into grassy and well-watered plains, varied with mountainous and picturesque scenery. A journey of a little less than nine months brought them to the mouth of Leichardt River, on the coast of Carpentaria. Instead of returning by the same route, the party struck off to the east, reaching Port Denison, the northernmost of the sea-coast settlements in Queensland. This expedition acquired much valuable information, and settled some doubtful questions concerning the interior.

There have been other minor expeditions important in their results. The continent has now been crossed some six or eight times since the beginning of 1860, and the principal mysteries have been cleared up. There are doubtless still large tracts of which nothing is known, but enough has been ascertained to enable us to form a pretty accurate estimate of the general character of the country.

The notion formerly prevailing that the whole interior was

one vast desert is now exploded. There are wide regions of perpetual desolation, but there are probably still wider ones of almost perpetual fertility. Then, again, there are extensive tracts which are exposed to the extremes of flood and drouth, and these are under the control of capricious influences, or hitherto incalculable laws. But there is reason to believe that the greater part of the country will soon be overspread with pastoral settlements. The probability is that the season of severest suffering in one region are not generally the same in those even adjacent; hence the colonies and districts may support each other, and in time means may be found to remedy the adverse physical peculiarities of the different sections.

The climate of Australia is of a favorable character, and appears for the most part to agree remarkably well with European constitutions. We have already alluded to the severe drouths to which the country is liable. It is also subject to extraordinary transitions of temperature. In the dryness of the atmosphere it is said to resemble Spain. There is less variation of the climate than might be inferred from the extent of the continent. Even the tropical regions are less subject to intense heat than many other regions of the same latitude; while the southerly portions, owing to the occasional hot winds blowing across the interior burning deserts, have frequently a high temperature. There is some conflict of testimony as to the effect of the climate on the longevity of emigrants; but we incline to the opinion that though the climatic change is great to those going either from Europe or America, the consequences are less deleterious than in any other exchange of residence of which we have ever known. In many instances the change has been remarkably beneficial, and even invalids and aged persons seem to have recovered their health and their youth. The statistics of mortality in the British army illustrates the climatic effect. In the West Indies the average mortality is over ten per cent. In Jamaica it is over fourteen per cent.; while throughout the Australian stations it is as low as one half per cent.

Not only does the country and the climate agree with the human species of other and distant nativity, but nearly all the lower animals, as well as vegetables of foreign origin, take most kindly to the new circumstances and thrive beyond all expectation.

The fauna of Australia seems to have been exceedingly meager and inferior, though curious. The kangaroo, of which there are nearly a hundred species, is the largest animal. The dingo, or native dog, is the most mischievous. We have already seen how sheep and cattle flourish and multiply, becoming immediately from the first a source of immense wealth. Horses, hogs, and almost every other kind of domestic beast, as well as fowls, improve and rapidly increase their kind here. The llama, or alpaca of Peru, has lately been introduced. Mr. Ledger, at much expense and with great difficulty, originated this enterprise. The government of Peru prohibited the exportation of the animals, but he collected about eight hundred of them, drove them across the Andes, and shipped them to New South Wales. At first a number of them died, but they have now become acclimatized, and, like the other imported animals, are multiplying rapidly. It is estimated that within a few years the clip of llama wool will exceed fifty million pounds in weight. The great value of this product is well known.

The agricultural resources of Australia are as yet scarcely begun to be developed. Till within the last half dozen years comparatively little attention has been given to them. The raising of stock and growing of wool, occupations so immensely lucrative, and more latterly the absorbing attraction of the mineral deposits, have diverted the minds of the people from the wealth of the soil. Add to this the preposterous land-system, which has prevented the securing of moderate farms, and has every way tended to discourage the agricultural interest. But of late it has become evident that there are in Australia vast regions of almost unsurpassed farming country, and that with comparatively little labor and care nearly all the most valuable articles of produce in the United States and in Europe can be grown here with great profit. Wheat, corn, barley, potatoes, millet, rye, oats and English grasses are becoming largely cultivated; also indigo, (which is indigenous,) arrow-root, tea, coffee, and ginger; while tobacco, sugar, and cotton, the three great slave-grown articles of commerce, it is confidently asserted can be secured in the largest quantities by Europeans on the shores of the Pacific. The notion has prevailed in this country, and scarcely less in England, that these articles could not safely and profitably be cultivated by white

labor. This opinion is, however, now nearly exploded, and especially so far as Australia is concerned. Recent investigations and observations demonstrate that even in the tropical districts of that continent persons of European nativity and descent work as freely and with as little risk in the open air as in the climate of the temperate zone. It is also proved in other portions of that country, as it has been elsewhere, that free, well-fed, high-priced English labor is, under fair circumstances of competition, more profitable than cheap African or Asiatic labor; of course, in the long run, far more profitable than slave labor.

Tobacco is indigenous to the soil, and plants of great luxuriance have been found along the banks of some of the New South Wales rivers. The manufactured article has been pronounced superior to that of America. The sugar-cane has been tried somewhat extensively, and the experiment is so far successful as to induce great numbers to enter upon its culture, to which there are extensive tracts adapted. On the Clarence River, two degrees south of Brisbane, the canes have yielded four tons of sugar to the acre.

In the colony of Queensland there is probably a region nearly as large as the present cotton-producing section of our own land which is particularly adapted to the production of that, at the present time, so important staple. The sea-island cotton, which is here confined to a narrow belt of coast of no great extent, is there found in great luxuriance, and is perhaps indigenous. It has this advantage over the American plant, in that, while the latter has to be renewed every year, the shrubs of the former continue to improve up to the third and fourth year. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce, reporting on the samples of this cotton, says, they are "far superior to cotton from any other part of the world." It has been declared authoritatively that from this cotton "yarn could be produced finer than any that could be manufactured in India or Great Britain."

But it is well known that the demand for this more costly variety is not so great as for the shorter staple, or New Orleans variety. Whether the latter, which is a more profitable crop in our southern states than the higher-priced article, can be as profitably cultivated in Queensland, is a problem not yet fully solved. The prospects of engaging in the culture of the coarser

descriptions are, however, not unfavorable. But whatever may be done there or elsewhere, we do not apprehend that our own country is likely to suffer from the development in Australia of this important branch of agriculture and commerce, especially under the now almost certain improvement of our own industrial system.

Upon the mineral wealth of Australia we need say but little, for the reason that thousands who know nothing else about the country know that it is a land of gold to which multitudes have resorted from many countries, our own included, to gather the rich spoil. It is now nearly thirteen years since the discovery of the gold fields. The first were found by a Mr. Hargreaves, in the Bathurst district, in New South Wales. He had lived several years in the vicinity, but had left the colony and gone to California when the precious metal was discovered there. Returning, he was struck with the resemblance of the geological formation in his own neighborhood to that of California. He commenced searching for gold, which he was not long in discovering. About four months after still richer deposits were found in the colony of Victoria. Gold fields have since been discovered, though none so rich or extensive as the two named, in various parts of the continent. With the important and remarkable consequences of this discovery all are familiar, for it has been the same there substantially as in our own country.

Besides gold, there are valuable iron mines; also mines of tin, lead, and especially of copper. Extensive beds of coal, too, have been brought to light, and have proved veritable mines of wealth to their proprietors.

The aborigines of Australia are almost unanimously described by all writers on the subject as the lowest and most degraded of the human family. They are inferior in feature and figure to the Africans; of a dark earth-brown color; "with sloe-black savage eyes widely set against their high cheek bones, and under protruding bushy black eyebrows; with distended nostrils, wide mouth, broad pouting lips, matted long black hair, shrunken frame, long thin arms, short outspread feet, spindle-legs, bedaubed and greased from head to foot, and without decency and without shame." These are the most general characteristics, though there is a considerable variety in the different tribes, some of them being more brave and

warlike than others. They have hitherto persistently withstood all attempts to civilize and Christianize them. Their numbers have been variously estimated at from two hundred thousand to four hundred thousand. But whether more or less, they are rapidly diminishing, and in not many years they will probably have wholly disappeared before the superior race, following the universal law.

We have sketched the history and character of Australia without much reference to the neighboring islands of New Zealand and Tasmania, either of which is large enough for two or three European kingdoms, besides some smaller but still important colonies. But we may easily see here the elements of a mighty Anglo-Saxon empire forming on the other side of the world, in countries rich in natural resources and with superior facilities for commerce. Within a very few years there will be ten or twelve great and populous colonies, each enjoying the chief features of popular sovereignty, yet still recognizing dependence on the mother country. That this dependence will be perpetuated is scarcely reasonable to expect; and the probability is that by the time another century opens an independent Anglo-Saxon nation, the Confederate Republic of Australasia, will be among the mighty and influential powers of the earth.

Art. VII.—CHRISTOLOGY.

The doctrine of Christ is at once the most important and the most inscrutable that was ever made the subject of human thought. It is the most important because it comprehends not only the doctrine of God, but of God in his several manifestations of mercy in behalf of our race; the most inscrutable, because it involves the mysteries not only of Godhead and manhood, but of these multiplied into each other by the union of the two natures in one person.

The pre-existent Logos; the humanity with parentage ineffably mysterious; the Logos and humanity constituting one

personality; this person, capable alike of being tempted and of succoring them that are tempted; of weeping at the grave of a friend, and of raising that friend from the dead; of dying himself, and yet able to "destroy him that hath the power of death;" whose life was a miracle not only of wisdom and power, but of tenderness and love: such a person is the product of no human thought or philosophy, but the "Son of God with power."

The doctrine of Jesus is thus stated: "Thou shalt bring forth a son and shalt call his name Jesus." Although this was the name by which he was called, both in childhood and manhood, by those who knew him only as a man, yet we dare not say that *Jesus* was a *personal* designation of his humanity, because this might imply that there were two *persons* to be united instead of two *natures*. But whether personal or official, it was the name selected for Mary's son, for that which should be born of her. If it should be contended that the *act* of incarnation did not take place at the birth, but previously, it would not necessarily nor probably follow that more than humanity was born of the virgin; for if God, the Logos, might "forsake" Jesus during the agonies of the crucifixion, might he not also at his birth? Our persons are formed by the union of soul and body; and as the death of the body, and its consequent long sleep in the grave, do not make it necessary that the soul should sleep there with it, in order to maintain the integrity of the person, so the humanity of Christ, whether it be in the womb of the virgin or cold (that is, the *body* of it) in the tomb, belongs as much to the *person* of the Son of God as when the glory of the manifested presence makes his "face to shine as the sun, and his raiment white as the light." I think, therefore, we may safely affirm that nothing but the humanity of Christ was born of the virgin. Mary was the mother of Jesus, not of God. She is called the mother of Jesus, but not of Christ. Strictly speaking, therefore, Jesus is the proper name for all of Christ that is human, though without doubt it is sometimes used, by an interchange of appellations between the two natures, to designate the entire personality, as are vine, servant, and other names which are not at all appropriate in respect of his divinity.

We cannot well overestimate the importance of the doctrine

of the pure, essential humanity of Christ. Without this there could be no proper body for sacrifice, as will appear in the sequel. But to ascribe super-humanity to Jesus, to make him the "Son of God" simply because he was begotten by the Holy Ghost, is both a radical and an inexcusable error. For why should a man begotten of the virgin by the Holy Ghost be superhuman, any more than a woman taken from the side of a man by the same power? or than the first man, who was created by a still more direct exercise of divine power, and consequently with less intervention of secondary causes? What, therefore, was above humanity, as developed in the life of Jesus, was not because of the miraculous conception, but because the "Logos was made flesh." Nor was the flesh any less, nor any more flesh, because the Logos was united with it. And such clearly is the Scripture doctrine; for it is said, "that as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the *same*." The son of Mary, therefore, was essentially human, and his name was called *Jesus*.

But the son of Mary, by an interchange of appellations, is also called the "Son of God." I say by an *interchange* of *appellations;* for neither the *character* of that humanity, nor the *mode* by which it took its existence, entitles it, any more than Adam, to be designated the Son of God. But if it be replied that both are so called, this of itself is sufficient to show that in respect to Christ it is not chiefly in view of the reason above stated, because this would make it no longer true that he is the *only begotten* Son of God, which he is declared to be. Both Calvin and Watson maintain that the title "Son of God" is a *personal* designation of the Divine *nature*, and that the Sonship was just as much a fact before the incarnation as after it—that Jesus was called the son of God, not because of the miraculous conception, but on account of the Deity and eternal existence of the Logos which was incarnated. And this view of the question is well sustained by the fact that neither Jesus nor his disciples ever claimed that he was the Son of God on the ground of the miraculous conception. In regard to Christ, it was a fact he never mentioned; and in respect to the disciples, they doubtless were ignorant of it; for this was one of the things which Mary kept and pondered secretly in her heart. It has been held by some that Luke i, 35, "The

Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," proves that the title "Son" was given to Christ, either with reference to the miraculous conception of the human nature, or with reference to the *act* of incarnation. But it should be remembered that he was called the Son of God because the power of the Highest overshadowed the virgin, which is distinct from the fact that his humanity was formed in her womb immediately by God. Mr. Watson holds that the effect of this overshadowing would be the assumption of humanity by the divine nature of him who is, in that nature, *the Son;* but that he is so called, not because a divine person assumed humanity, but because that divine person was antecedently the Son of God.

The doctrine of the Logos is clearly stated by John. Of his discourse on this subject the following may be taken as a correct syllabus: "The Logos was in the beginning, was with God, and was God; and the Logos was made flesh and dwelt among us." Here are two facts distinctly stated, namely: 1. The essential divinity of a pre-existent person called the Logos; and, 2. That this Logos was made flesh. To fathom the first is to fathom divinity and determine the conditions of existence that is underived and that never began to be. The explication of the second will fall more properly under another division of the subject.

The doctrine of Christ seems to be stated in these words: "The Logos was made flesh"—"God was manifest in the flesh." The word *made* in the first thesis evidently is qualified and limited by the word *manifest* in the second. For the divinity was no more made flesh according to the usual acceptation of the word, than the flesh was made divinity. To lose either nature in the other is to fail of the end proposed in the union of the two. We conclude, therefore, that the words "made flesh" and "manifest in the flesh" denote that inexplicable union in one person of the Godhead and manhood—of the Son of God and the son of Mary. And I will assume that this person is not so well represented by any other name as that of Christ. "Son of God," it is true, is a *personal* designation of the divine nature, and as appropriate after the incarnation as before it, and no more so; and hence it is, per-

haps, that in the use of this title we lose sight somewhat of the humanity of the Saviour, as we do not when we use the word Christ, which, though it be an official title, never realized the object for which it stood until it found the Godhead and manhood united in one person. But while there was a Son of God before, *there was no* Christ until the incarnation; therefore no other word can so well symbolize the union of the two natures, whereof is one Christ, as this we have named.

At this point we present the decision of the Council of Chalcedon in the fifth century: "That in Christ there is *one person;* in the unity of the person *two natures*, the divine and the human; and that there is no change, or mixture, or confusion of these two natures, but that each retains its own distinguishing properties." With this formula agrees the Athanasian creed: "Perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting—who, although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but *one Christ:* one, not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person; for as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is *one Christ.*" The creed of our own Church, copied almost *verbatim* from that of the Church of England, comports most happily with those ancient symbols of believers in Christ. "The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is *one Christ*, very God and very man."

At the union of these two natures the name Logos is dropped as no longer applicable to the new personality. Christ is never called the Logos, and the Logos is never called Christ. As at present existing, we are not at liberty to think of the Logos separately from humanity—Christ is never to be divided. Now whatever is the difference between the Logos and the Logos made flesh, is the difference between the Logos and Christ. Christ is the Logos and something more; namely, that which was born of the virgin united with the Logos. And as until the incarnation there was no Christ, no union of the Godhead and manhood, whereof is *one Christ*, so after that event, though

the Logos remained, the union of God with man, forming a new hypostasis, rendered that name (we speak reverently) inadequate to describe the person as now existing. To call the person Christ the Logos is to affirm the divinity of Christ's humanity, because that humanity helps to constitute the personality. To constitute such a personality each nature is essential; and whatever is done or suffered by either nature is done and suffered by the person Christ; and whatever is affirmed of either nature is affirmed of the person, to the extent that each nature constitutes the personality. But it does not follow, nor is it true, that what is done and suffered by and affirmed of each nature is done and suffered by and affirmed of the other also. The two natures, though united, are distinct—they are neither mixed nor blended.

This person is divine; the character of the personality being determined by and in favor of the higher nature, which is a divine nature. Or, perhaps, to speak with greater theological accuracy, we should say that *im*personal humanity was taken up by the hypostatic union into the *person* of the Son of God, and this person is divine. But because this person is divine, we may not hence conclude that he is all divinity—he is humanity as well. This subject finds, perhaps, its most adequate illustration in the hypostatical union of the human soul and body. Man is a spiritual being, yet he is not all spirit; he is also said to be mortal, yet the better part of him never dies. So we say that Christ was born and that he died, but we do not understand either that divinity was born or that it could die; and though truly enough affirmed, it is true only in so far as humanity constitutes the person Christ. Christ suffered death, but clearly he suffered it in his human nature. We therefore broadly distinguish between *this* nature of the divine person and the divine nature of that person.

If it be true that both the divine and human natures are essential in order to constitute the person Christ, it will follow that if either the Godhead or manhood be taken away the person would no longer exist. Take away the divinity, and we have a man; take away the manhood, and we have the Logos; unite the two, and we have the divine person Christ; yet not all of that person is God, though the Godhead constitutes by far the greater part of the personality. To affirm compre-

hensively of the whole person Christ that he is God, is to affirm the divinity of his humanity. But the apostle says, not that Christ is God, but that "Christ is God's." If the person Christ be God, then the blood of God was shed, and God suffered and died. The difference between God and Christ is precisely the difference, whatever that may be, there is between the God and "God manifest in the flesh." Christ is not usually called God, but the "Son of God." In those instances where he is called "God," "The mighty God," "The everlasting Father," it is as evident that respect is had to his divinity, as that his humanity alone is intended when he is presented to our minds as a "child born," a "Son given," and is called "vine," "door," and "servant." The chemistry which thus resolves this person into his primary or constituent elements is divine. The laboratory is the Bible. And we trust we have not presumed to take upon ourselves the high office of determining anything beyond what is written therein, or fairly deducible therefrom.

Christ, says the Athanasian symbol, is *one;* one, not by confusion of substance, but by *unity* of person. In respect to personality, Christ is undivided. In a good sense Christ was born in Bethlehem, and grew in stature, and in favor with God and man. It was Christ who was tempted, and it is Christ who is able to succor them that are tempted. It was Christ who wept at the grave of Lazarus, and it was he who raised Lazarus from the dead. It was Christ who died, and it was Christ who plucked the sting from death, and robbed the grave of its victory. And, blessed be God! it *is* Christ who ever liveth to make intercession for us.

But from this absolute unity of personality it does not follow that we may not refer the things said of and done by Christ, some to one nature and some to the other. The doctrine of unity is not at all contravened by saying that *this* affirmation made by Christ refers to his divine nature, and *that* to his human nature; that Godhead did *this*, and that manhood suffered *that;* for what the Godhead did was done by Christ, and what the manhood suffered was suffered by Christ. Take the passage already referred to, Isaiah ix, 6: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: his name shall be called The mighty God, The everlasting Father."

Now as it was only the humanity that was born of the virgin, so of Christ it is the divine nature alone that can sustain the wondrous names,—The mighty God, The everlasting Father. The same necessity is upon us of distinguishing between the natures of Christ, if we consider what he did and suffered, and what he said concerning himself. Take, for example, his temptation. The doctrine of the "unity of the person" justifies the declaration that Christ was tempted; and yet we have the authority of an apostle for saying that God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man. In the temptation, therefore, we must count out the divine nature, and the humanity of Christ, as exposed to it, is what there is remaining. Take again those two declarations of Christ concerning himself: "I and my Father are one"—"My Father is greater than I." Now it is philosophically impossible that any essence should be one with and yet inferior to the same thing. But what is affirmed is true of Christ, because in the unity of his person there is not oneness or confusion of substance, but two dissimilar natures, concerning which, as in this case, opposite things, and things seemingly in conflict, may be truly and justly affirmed. In respect to his divine nature Christ and his Father were one—the "Logos was God;" but his humanity alone being regarded, and his Father was greater than he. Christ wept at the grave of Lazarus; but can the divine nature weep? On the cross Christ exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Did the divine nature join with the human in this cry? or can divinity forsake itself? Christ died on the cross; but did the divine Logos die? Who would hesitate to say that Christ suffered death on the cross? And yet who would claim that he suffered it in more than his human nature? Again Christ is declared to be both the "root and offspring of David"—"David's Lord and David's son." Of the undivided person, Christ, this is strictly true; but it is true only of his divinity that he is David's root and Lord, as it is true only of his humanity that he is the offspring and son of David.

This just distinction, and method of interpretation based upon it, have had the almost unanimous support of the great masters in theology. "Does any one ask," says Mr. Watson, "if Jesus Christ was truly God, how he could be born and die?

how his soul could be exceeding sorrowful even unto death?" be "forsaken of his father?" purchase the Church with "his own blood?" etc., etc. The answer is, that he was also *man*. If, on the other hand, it be a matter of surprise that a *visible man* should heal diseases at his will, and without referring to any higher authority, as he often did, be associated with the Father in solemn ascriptions of glory and thanksgiving, and bear even the awful names of God, names of description and revelation, names which express divine attributes, what is the answer? The only hypothesis explanatory of all these statements is, that Christ is God as well as man. He says again, "This distinction is expressed, in modern theological language, by considering some things which are spoken of Christ as said of his divine, others of his human nature; and he who takes this principle of interpretation along with him will seldom find any difficulty in apprehending the sense of the sacred writers, though the subjects themselves be often, to human minds, inscrutable." Says Bishop Burnet, "A man is called tall, fair, and healthy, from the state of his body; and learned, wise, and good, from the qualities of his mind: so Christ is called holy, harmless, and undefiled; is said to have died, risen, and ascended up into heaven, with relation to his human nature: he is also said to be in 'the form of God, to have created all things, to be the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person,' with relation to his divine nature." Calvin, Knapp, and others might be quoted to the same effect; but Paul, a greater than any of these, makes precisely this distinction, when he says of Christ, that he was "made of the seed of David *according to the flesh*." The objection that this view of the subject *divides* Christ, is quite too shallow to merit a labored reply. We see in a piece of machinery, for instance, iron and wood combined; we say that the iron is used for this purpose, and the wood for that; but we do not have to separate them, nor divide nor destroy the machinery in order to distinguish between their properties, and the uses to which those properties are put. It is thus we are compelled to distribute to the two natures of Christ the properties belonging to each, rendering to God the things that are God's, and to humanity the things belonging to humanity, not failing to observe mean-

time that, by the conditions of this wonderful union, the things belonging both to God and man belong to Jesus Christ our Lord.

In the light of this subject the question, Did the divine nature participate in the sufferings of Christ? is easily answered. If it be meant, Did the divine sympathize with the human? the fact of the union of the two is sufficient to demonstrate, not only sympathy with this nature, but with all the race which this is to redeem. But if it be intended to ask whether the divine nature *suffered* by this sympathy, one might assert even dogmatically, if it were necessary, that it did not and could not. So far as we know, suffering implies weakness. Now since we also know that God is not weak, and have no intimation from the Scriptures that he suffered or can suffer, he is indeed a poor Baconian, and a reckless theological adventurer, who, in the face of so broad an induction, would argue against all parity of reason, that the divine nature suffered in the person of Christ. We have no patience, and ought to have none, with the sickly sentimentalism and vaporing theology which know no better way to make man *happy* than to make divinity *suffer*. We ought at least to be able to assume, in the discussion of this point, that no one would assert such suffering on the part of the divine nature of Christ, unless he was convinced that the exigencies of the case demanded it; for there are few minds so unappreciative that they will not find the scenes of the cross and Calvary sufficiently tragic without adding fiction to facts. But not only do these exigencies *not* demand such suffering, but the nature of the case forbids that it should be.

The penalty of the law is *death*, and not suffering, only as the former involves the latter. Much that Christ suffered, we dare not try to determine how much was intended to qualify *him* for the work of his priesthood. The necessity for this terrible discipline involves a mystery too deep for our feeble comprehension. Nor should we dare to tread this road at all had not an apostle, guided by the light of inspiration, gone before us. Paul says: "It became him in bringing many sons unto glory to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through *sufferings*"—"For in that he himself hath *suffered*, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted." If the penalty consisted in both suffering and death, and it

were thought necessary that the divine nature should suffer in order to make atonement, would it not appear just as necessary, and for the same reasons precisely, that that nature should *die* as well as suffer? If the penalty were suffering, the completeness of the scheme of redemption might depend on the *quantity* of those sufferings. But this is not so. The commercial idea of the atonement is now pretty much abandoned, and very justly. Declarations to the effect that Christ suffered in his person as much as would have been inflicted on the race, or even on a single soul, are derogatory to the scheme of redemption, and leave no room at all for the exercise of mercy. The Gospel offer of salvation to man goes not, therefore, on the principle of *quid pro quo*, so many grains of suffering for so many ounces of mercy scrupulously and parsimoniously weighed out, but upon the principle of substitution, the death of the innocent instead of the guilty. The penalty being death, the *suffering* of the divine nature in no way assists the human in *dying*. So far from it, that it seemed impossible for Jesus to die until God had forsaken him. It was this, and not the crucifixion, justice, and not man, that executed the penalty on the offered substitute.

It should be distinctly remarked here that the doctrine of substitution does not go upon the assumption that the acceptance of a substitute gives the law any new force, or justice any rights not previously possessed. The penalty could be inflicted only on the nature of the transgressor, or on a like nature substituted therefor. Hence "Christ took not on him the nature of angels." If he had, the lower nature in the person so constituted would have been at least one grade higher than that on which justice had claim for the sin of man. But if justice had no right to inflict penalties on angelic natures, much less had it on the divine. But now Christ took on him the seed of Abraham, that he might have whereof to offer; as it is written, "A body hast thou prepared me."

But it may be asked, Wherefore was it necessary that Christ should take on him the seed of Abraham or human nature at all? The answer is, that, so far as we can see, it was necessary because atonement without it was impossible. For where all are guilty, and alike under the same penalty, and that penalty death, it requires no argument to prove that substitution

is out of the question. But suppose we have given the manhood of Christ without the divine Logos united with it, we have now a sinless nature, and one not under the penalty, but one that is nevertheless necessarily disqualified for performing the functions of a vicar in the high sense demanded; because the nature and person are under law, the demands of which it is impossible they should ever transcend. The state of the case is plainly this: the sacrifice must be more than a creature, and in some sense less than a god. To this conclusion we never could have come had not the great mystery been enacted before us. Precisely what is needed, but what never could have been invented by any human genius, or the combined wisdom of any age, or of all ages, is plainly realized in the person of our Redeemer. In him we have the sinless nature, not under the penalty, and of the same grade or kind with that which is taken up by its union with the divinity into a higher personality than that on which the infracted law has claim. The same truths precisely which St. Paul comprehends in these words: "For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and *made higher than the heavens.*" Thus the object of the incarnation seems to have been, to make it possible for humanity to suffer for humanity under, if I may so speak, the patronage of the *person* of the Son of God, to accomplish which it seems there was no other way than to take this humanity up into that divine personality. It was thus sacrifice was made possible, and super-legal merit obtained.

If now it be required, in order to our salvation, that this divine person shall suffer, to do this it will not be necessary that he should suffer in his divine nature; for, as we have already seen, whatever is done or suffered in either nature is done and suffered by the divine person Christ. Christ must suffer that man may live; but this suffering is achieved as truly by inflicting the penalty, death, on his human nature, which is of the same kind with that under the curse, and on which the law has claim, as it would by involving the divine nature in these sufferings, on which the law has no claim.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The Essays and Reviews.—The late decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council continued to be the subject of much agitation among the members of the Church of England. The most important document which the decision has called forth was drawn up at a meeting held at Oxford on the 25th of February. This "Oxford Declaration" is to the following effect:

We, the undersigned, presbyters and deacons in holy orders of the Church of England and Ireland, hold it to be our bounden duty to the Church of England and Ireland, and to the souls of men, to declare our firm belief that the Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church, maintains without reserve or qualification the inspiration or divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing but being the word of God; and further teaches, in the words of our blessed Lord, that the "punishment" of the "cursed," equally with the "life" of the "righteous," is "everlasting."

The committee by whom this "Declaration" was framed consists of Dr. Clerke, Archdeacon of Oxford; Dr. Cotton, Provost of Worcester College; Archdeacon Denison; the Rev. W. R. Freemantle; Dr. Leighton, Warden of All Souls'; Dr. Miller, of Birmingham, and Dr. Pusey. This list contains the names of the leaders of both the High Churchmen and the Evangelical Party, and the majority of the clergymen of both parties hastened, consequently, to subscribe to it. There were, however, some notable exceptions. There was, first of all, a question raised respecting the lawfulness of signing it. Certain clergymen, foremost among whom stands Dr. Goode, Dean of Ripon, who agreed in principle with the "Declaration," were doubtful as to the legality of signing it, and a case was therefore prepared on the subject for the consideration and opinion of counsel. A joint opinion was obtained from Mr. A. J. Stephens, Q.C., LL.D., and Mr. J. C. Trail. The opinion sets forth that "it is evident that the declarants impeach the judgment of the judicial committee by affirming the converse of the propositions established by the judgment; and that fact, taken in connection with the language and tenor of 'the Declaration' and its title, is open to no other reasonable construction than that of an intention on the part of the declarants not to submit to the judgment pronounced by the queen." The opinion concludes in the following terms: "Under the foregoing acts and circumstances we are of opinion that it is not consistent with the obligations under which the clergy have placed themselves by their subscription to the three articles contained in the 36th canon to sign the 'declaration' drawn up at the meeting held at Oxford on the 25th of February, 1864."

On the other hand, however, an opinion was obtained from the attorney general (Sir Roundell Palmer) and Sir Hugh Cairns, two of the ablest lawyers of the English bar, declaring that while "the observance of articles 1 and 37 will of course involve, among other things, obedience and respect to any judgment, that is, to any sentence which the sovereign may pronounce in an ecclesiastical cause, on the recommendation of the judicial committee of the Privy Council," this is "wholly distinct from an assent to or acquiescence in the reasoning or statements pursued or advanced by members of the judicial committee as the grounds of their recommendation to Her Majesty." "It is to this sentence of the sovereign, and to that alone, that the subjects of the sovereign, both lay and clerical, have to look; and it is the sentence which those who are affected by it have to obey." The two eminent jurists, therefore, hold it to be not in any way unlawful to subscribe to the Oxford Declaration.

Other parties condemned the declaration itself. One of the first among these was the Rev. F. D. Maurice, who branded it with the designation of a new test, and asserted that the agreement between the High Churchmen and the Evangelicals was only brought about by each one putting upon the words of the declaration a different meaning. He thought that even Dr. Williams and Mr Wilson, the condemned essayists, might sign it, if they would follow such an example. This called out a declaration from Mr. Wilson, to this effect, that he

would not sign it if he could and could not if he would. A spiey correspondence also ensued between Dr. Pusey and F. D. Maurice, in the columns of the London *Times*, and both combatants, though elergymen of the same Church, came at length to the conelusion that they did not "believe in the same God." Some low churehmen opposed it, because in view of the Romanizing tendencies of the high church party they deemed it the right course of the evangelieal body to stand off from any amalgamation with persons holding such dangerous opinions. High Church clergymen, on the other hand, refused their signatures because the word "presbyter" had been used instead of "priest." Nevertheless, the declaration received the signatures of some twelve thousand elergymen, a elear majority of the entire clergy of the Established Church, which in all numbers about nineteen thonsand elergymen. The petition was presented by a large deputation, on May 12, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who on this occasion was accompanied by the Bishops of Carlisle, Gloucester, and Bristol, St. Asaphs, Bangor, Rochester, Moray and Ross. The archbishop, in the name of the bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, expressed his joy at the sentiments expressed in this declaration. It strengthened, he remarked, their conviction that the Church would never be disposed to propagate opinions tending to subvert the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The bishops, on their part, would ever feel it to be their duty to maintain the authoritative teaching of the Church, humbly trusting to receive guidance from above.

Soon after the publication of the judgment of the Privy Council, the Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a pastoral letter to the elergy and laity of the province of Canterbury, setting forth his views respecting the decision. The archbishop states that while he would not undertake to define inspiration, he accepted the testimony of the Church that the Bible *was* God's word written, and therefore Dr. Williams must be wrong in saying that it is only the voice of devout reason in the congregation. As to his acquiescence in the judgment on the point bearing upon eternal punishment, he says it arose from no doubt in his own mind that the Church teaches the eternity both of rewards and of punishments, but that from the misty way in which Mr. Wilson had put his views, he doubted whether they had the meaning which the prosecutors attached to them.

In the session of the Convocation of Canterbury, which opened on the 19th of April, the subject of the Essays and Reviews came again before the bishops, in consequence of a deputation from the lower house having brought up a *gravamen*, signed by forty "dignified and benefieed" elergymen, affirming that injury had been done to the Church by the delay of synodieal judgment upon the subject, and that it was expedient now to proceed to such judgment. The Bishop of Oxford explained that the action of convocation with regard to this volume had slumbered since July, 1861, in consequenee of the book being under the jurisdiction of the civil courts. Now that these courts had definitely and so lamentably determined the question, the authority of this convocation revived; and he proposed that they should not allow the matter to rest longer. After showing that it was in the power of this convocation to deal with the book, and even, as some lawyers thought, with the authors too, though he did not propose that, he proceeded to say that he thought the authority of the convocation would come in to supplement the defects of the Privy Council. He held that the Church had some power to deal with error, and that power was not possessed by the judieial committee of the Privy Council, which could only try the subtle forms of modern heresy by the honest literal application of ancient formularies, that had scarcely any bearing on these new heresies. A condemnation of the "Essays" by the House of Bishops, he believed, would tend, in the minds of many, to re-establish a faith which had been grievously shaken. He moved the appointment of a committee to consider and report on the subject. The Bishops of London and St. David's opposed the motion. The Bishop of St. David's said it would be better to sign a dogmatic declaration of doctrine than to undertake such work as that. He then criticised severely the Oxford Declaration, and declared that so far from considering the eleven thousand names appended to it as adding any weight to its statements, he regarded them "in the light of a row of figures preceded by a decimal point." "The declaration was a sort of moral

torture, for the adjuration employed implied that unless persons appended their names to it they were wanting in love to God and the souls of men." Such an object was "worthy of the severest reprobation." The Bishop of London deprecated any course which would oblige them to reconsider the report of the Lower House on Essays and Reviews "Of all the foul productions it had ever been the misfortune of controversy to call out, this, the production of a single individual, was the worst, and more calculated than anything he had ever seen to injure the Christian faith. He deprecated disinterring from the death an unfortunate paper which he trusted no intelligent layman of the Church had ever seen." The bishop further repudiated the notion that something ought to be done to help God to defend his truth, and echoed Dr. Thirlwall's (the Bishop of St. David's) opinion of the "melancholy" Oxford Declaration.

In May the Archbishop of York issued a pastoral to the clergy and laity of his province, in which he contends that the formularies of the Church of England assert the doctrine that the Bible is the word of God, and that the doctrine of a terminable punishment finds no countenance whatever from Holy Scripture. In conclusion, the archbishop says: "It would be vain to deny that this trouble of the Church has a real foundation. And yet, my brethren, there is no reason for immoderate fear. The Church of England depends for her teaching, not upon prosecutions and decisions of courts, but upon the solemn undertaking, freely made by her ministers, that they will teach the people according to her articles and formularies."

MAY ANNIVERSARIES.—The anniversaries of the month of May have again proved that Christian liberality in England is not on the decrease. We give below a list of the religious societies of Great Britain, and their incomes in 1863 and 1864, classifying them according to their fields of operations.

I. FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts	1863. £93,326	1864. £87,832
Church Missionary Soc.	151,218	154,247
Wesleyan* "	141,638	131,258
London "	81,924	81,072

* The Wesleyan Missionary Society reported besides promises of £170,000 for its great Jubilee Fund.

Baptist Missionary Soc.	£27,189	£34,419
United Methodist "	7,377	11,585
Primitive Meth. "	11,891	12,557
Turkish Missions, etc..	....	2,575

II. COLONIAL AND CONTINENTAL MISSIONS.

Colonial & Contin'l Soc.	29,771	23,919
Colonial Missionary Soc.	....	6,718
Foreign Aid Society....	....	2,418
Evangelical Contin'l Soc.	.....	1,983

III. HOME MISSIONS.

Church Pastoral Aid Soc.	41,692	44,845
London City Mission...	36,761	42,476
Irish Church Missions.	22,724	26,672
Wesleyan Home Miss..	14,000	15,000
Home Miss. Soc. (Cong'l)	9,000	4,093
Irish Evangelical Soc..	....	4,015
Baptist Home Missions.	1,700	1,375
Ch. of England Scripture Readers' Society.....	10,285	11,193

IV. EDUCATIONAL SOCIETIES.

Sunday-School Union..	19,075	19,831
Ragged-School Union .	4,700	9,594
Religious Book Society.	....	9,480
Christian Vernacular Education Soc. for India	4,303	5,718

V. JEWISH SOCIETIES.

London Jews' Society..	32,534	32,681
British Jews' Society ..	....	6,585
Operative Jewish Conv's	....	4,331

VI. MISCELLANEOUS SOCIETIES.

Religious Tract Society	95,302	118,679
Army Scrip. Readers' "	....	9,477
Protestant Reforma'n "	6,000	4,619
Naval and Mil. Bible "	3,252	1,782
Seamen's Chn Friend "	....	940
Protestant Alliance....	1,500	1,539
Unitarian Bible Society	982	747
Missions to Seamen....	....	7,310
British & For. Bib. Soc.	157,990	168,905

TOTAL IN 1864.

Foreign Missions	518,845
Colonial and Continental Miss..	49,038
Home Missions.....	149,369
Educational Societies	44,623
Jewish Societies.....	43,537
Miscellaneous	145,693
British & Foreign Bible Society	168,905
	£1,110,000

It will be noted that this list embraces only the religious societies of England, not those of Scotland and Ireland.

THE PRESBYTERIANS OF SCOTLAND.—According to a statement in the London Times, the United Presbyterian Church had, last year, 578 congregations, with 170,531 communicants, and an attendance on Sundays of 198,473. The total income of the Church was £216,618, being at the rate of £1 5s. 4½d. from each member. Nearly a fourth of the

whole income was devoted to missionary and benevolent objects. The Free Church may be considered as nearly twice as strong. It had last year 892 ministers with congregations, and 264,000 communicants. Its income was £341,934. It has three colleges, with fourteen professors and 196 students; while the United Presbyterian Church has 151 students. It has 610 teachers in its schools, which are attended by 48,039 pupils.

The joint committees appointed by the two Churches at their meetings last year, to consider and report on the means of forming a union, have ever since been diligently at work. At one of the last meetings of the commission of the Free Church, Dr. Buchanan, the convener of the committee of that body, presented an interim report, from which it appeared that the great question between the two parties was the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. They had proceeded so far in the examination of this question as to ascertain on what points they agreed and on what points they disagreed. They are agreed in holding that civil government is an ordinance of God; that the civil magistrate ought to further the interests of Christianity among his subjects in every way consistent with its spirit and precepts; that it is not his province to impose a creed on his subjects, or to interfere with the government of the Church; but that such questions as the ceremonies that are to constitute marriage, the observance of the Sabbath, and the appointment of days of national humiliation and thanksgiving, may properly fall under his regulation; always taking care, however, that neither Church nor State intrude into the proper province of the other. The following statements, drawn up by the committee of each denomination, present their diverging opinions on the relation of the Church to the secular government:

STATEMENTS OF FREE CHURCH COMMITTEE.

1. That while the civil magistrate must not so sustain himself a public judge of true or false religion as to dictate to his subjects in matters of faith, and has no authority in spiritual things, yet, owing obligation to Christ, he may lawfully acknowledge, as being in accordance with the word of God, the creed and jurisdiction of the Church. As a further act of homage to Christ, it is his duty, when necessary or expedient, to employ the national resources in aid of the Church, provided always that in doing so, while reserving to himself full control over the temporalities, which are his own gift, he abstain from all authoritative interference in the internal government of the Church. And while the Church must ever maintain the essential and perpetual obligation which Christ has laid on all his people to support and extend his Church by free-will offerings, yet, in entire consistency with said obligation, the Church may lawfully accept aid from the civil magistrate when her spiritual independence is preserved entire. But it must always be a question, to be judged of according to times and circumstances, whether or not such aid ought to be given by the civil magistrate, as well as whether or not it ought to be accepted by the Church. And the question must, in every instance, be decided by each of the two parties judging for itself, on its own responsibility.

2. It follows from the preceding article, that any branch of the Christian Church consenting to be in alliance with the state, and to accept its aid, upon the condition of being subject to the authoritative control of the state or its courts in spiritual matters, or continuing in such connection with the state as involves such subjection, must be held to be so far unfaithful to the Lord Jesus Christ as King and Head of his Church. And upon this ground, in accordance with the history and the constitutional principles of the Church of Scotland, a protest is to be maintained against the present Establishment in Scotland.

STATEMENTS OF UNITED PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE.

1. That, inasmuch as the civil magistrate has no authority in spiritual things, and as the employment of force in such matters is opposed to the spirit and precepts of Christianity, it is not within his province to legislate as to what is true in religion, to prescribe a creed or form of worship to his subjects, or to endow the Church from national resources; that Jesus Christ, as sole King and Head of his Church, has enjoined upon his people to provide for maintaining and extending it by free-will offerings; that this being Christ's ordinance, it excludes state aid for these purposes; and that adherence to it is the true safeguard of the Church's independence.

2. That the United Presbyterian Church, without requiring from her members any approval of the steps of procedure by their fathers, or interfering with the rights of private judgment in reference to them, are united in regarding as still valid the reasons on which they have hitherto maintained their state of secession and separation from the judica-

tories of the Established Church, as expressed in the authorized documents of the respective bodies of which the United Presbyterian Church is formed, and in maintaining the lawfulness and obligation of separation from ecclesiastical bodies in which dangerous error is tolerated, or the discipline of the Church, or the rights of her ministry or members, are disregarded. Moreover, though uniformity of opinion with respect to civil establishments of religion is not a term of communion in the United Presbyterian Church, yet the views on this subject held and universally acted on are opposed to these institutions; and the statements set forth in these distinctive articles are regarded by that Church as a protest against the Church Establishment in Scotland.

FRANCE.

THE RATIONALISTIC CONTROVERSY.—The long struggle between the Evangelical and the Liberal (Rationalistic) parties in the two Protestant State Churches of France appears to approach rapidly a crisis, and all the indications are, that the ultimate result will be a gradual forcing of the Rationalistic party out of the Church. The first months of the year 1864 are signalized by events that may have a decisive influence on the future fate of the State Churches. In February the Presbyterial Council of the Reformed Church of Paris took a decided step against the leader of the most advanced wing of Rationalists in the Reformed Church, Mr. Athanase Coquerel, junior. Mr. Coquerel had been chosen, in 1850, by Mr. Martin Paschoud, one of the Rationalistic pastors of Paris, for his suffragan. This choice was hesitatingly ratified by the Consistory, which limited his exercise of the pastoral functions, first to three years and then to two, always subject to re-election. As the tendencies of Mr. Coquerel became from year to year more positively Rationalistic, and as he recently had even expressed his approbation of the work of Renan, this year the Presbyterial Council, by a vote of twelve against three, declined to re-elect him.

Another and even more serious defeat was sustained by the Rationalistic party at the annual pastoral conferences, both the "special" conferences (confined to ministers and elders of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches) and the "general," (in which representatives of all the Protestant Churches of France take part.) Both the "special" and the "general" conferences lasted three days. At the former two propositions were discussed, one proposed by Professor Pedezert, "that the conference declare that the Reformed Church of France has positive doctrines and official bodies bound to make them respected," and the other proposed by Pastors Vaurigaud, Lourde-Rocheblave, and F. de Conink, asking the conference "to renew the steps taken to obtain from the government the restoration of the synods, a restoration the importance of which circumstances render daily more indispensable." The former of these propositions was solemnly and warmly discussed for two days. At length a declaration presented by M. Guizot, the celebrated statesman, who is an elder in the Reformed Church of Paris, was carried by 141 votes against 28. This declaration, after mentioning the doctrines which have been chiefly attacked of late by members of the Reformed Church, goes on to say:

"We regard these negations as entirely destructive both of the Christian religion and of the Reformed Church. We have a firm belief in God's supernatural action in the government of the world; in the Divine and supernatural inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, as well as in their sovereign authority in matters of religion; in the eternal divinity and miraculous birth, as well as in the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God-man, the Saviour and Redeemer of men. We are convinced that these foundations of the Christian religion are also the foundations of the Reformed Church, which has positively recognized them as such throughout its liturgy, and which, together with the universal Church, makes a public profession of its belief in them through the Apostle's Creed.

"We also adhere as firmly as any, both for those who think differently from us as well as for ourselves, to the tutelary principle of religious liberty. In virtue of this principle every one is free to make open profession of his belief, and to connect himself with those who hold the same views; but we cannot understand what sort of a Church that would be which should have no common faith, and in which the most diverse [illegible] even the most opposite doctrines could be professed at pleasure. Such a state of things would not be the exercise of religious liberty, but the destruction of religious society, which, more than any other society, needs that an inner and real sympathy should exist between its

members. The Reformed Church of France is an old and organized religious society; it has vital principles and historical institutions; and even in the absence and expectation of its synods, it has in its consistories and presbyterial councils legal powers which, according to the regulations of the state as well as of its own discipline, have the right, and are also bound to maintain its principles. The Reformed Church recognizes no other rule of faith than the Scriptures, and it has never admitted, nor could it ever admit, that those who contest the divine and supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures, and their sovereign authority in religious matters, should, notwithstanding this, be authorized to speak and teach in its name. We have the firm conviction that, in giving this expression to our inmost and common convictions, we do but express the feelings of the great majority of the members of our Church, at the same time that we continue loyal to the faith of our fathers, and to the dignity as well as stability of the Church which they established."

In moving this declaration, M. Guizot delivered a speech of remarkable power, which made a profound impression upon the conference. He spoke strongly against permitting every pastor to interpret the Bible as he liked. This he said "would be the abolition of the Reformed Church itself. One of the essential facts and great results of the Reformation of the sixteenth century was, that it did not leave the religious world under the exclusive dominion of the ecclesiastical world. It gave to the laymen, to the faithful, a place and a part in the government of the Church by the side of the clergy. Authority resides in bodies whether pastors and laymen sit, deliberate, and decide together."

The proposition relative to the restoration of the synods of the Church was nearly unanimously adopted without discussion. A committee, consisting of General D'Hauteville, General de Chabaud-Latour, Professor Pédézert, and the Pastors Fermaud, Vaurigaud, Horace Monod, and Rognon, was appointed to see the Minister of Public Worship and plead with him the cause of the synods.

The general pastoral conferences were of a very stormy character. The question discussed was, "Are not the existence of every Church and the rights of the faithful compromised by unlimited liberty as regards religious teaching?" and the reply voted as follows: "Considering that for some years past there have appeared, in books of all kinds, in the periodical press, in Protestant journals, and even in manuals of religious instruction, with the signatures of pastors and theological professors, opinions which attack not only the fundamental principle of the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures hitherto acknowledged by all the Churches of the Reformation, but the most elementary notions of Christianity; considering that the writers alluded to question the authenticity of the greater part of the Saviour's teaching, such as it is preserved to us in the Gospels, keep silence upon or deny his supernatural birth, miracles, and, above all, his resurrection, overturn not only the Christian idea of the creation of man in the image of God, and of his fall, but the very basis of natural religion, by shaking belief in the divine personality and in a future judgment; considering that the authors of these negations justify themselves by alleging that it is of the essence of a Protestant Church to admit unlimited freedom of teaching; this conference is of opinion, that as to what is involved in the conditions of the existence of every Church, the free expression in the pulpit, or by any other public and official means, of the doctrinal opinions of the pastors, has for necessary and legitimate limit the belief professed by the religious association from which those pastors derive their commission; and that as regards the rights of the faithful, the authority given to the pastors by their sacred ministry resides entirely in the conformity of their teaching with the declarations of the Holy Scriptures, and particularly in the fundamental doctrines of the divinity of Jesus Christ and redemption, which the universal Christian Church has always considered as evidently contained in the Bible, and which are expressed in all Protestant liturgies; and that consequently it is an abuse of power and spiritual tyranny to take advantage of the position as a minister of Jesus Christ and in a Christian Church, in order to propagate, directly or indirectly, doctrines contrary thereto. This declaration was voted by 160 against 6, several members of the minority having previously left the place of meeting. The minority had presented a counter declaration, so worded that both sides might join by giving their own different meanings to the expressions. The words "Jesus Christ, the Son of the living

God," occurring in it, an explanation was requested, when one of the signers of the proposition, Pastor Leblois, declared as it seemed, in concurrence with all the other signers, that Jesus was the son of God in the same sense that every Christian may become a son of God, according to Matthew v, 45.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

GERMANY.

THE CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS IN CONFLICT WITH ROME.—The undeniable learning, ability, and liberality of a large number of the Catholic theologians of Germany have found, for a long time past, small favor with the dominant party in Rome, represented especially in the ordinary ecclesiastical tribunals which there sit and rule, or try to rule, the Catholic world. While the vivifying influences of a learned Protestantism has stimulated the German Catholics to fresh labors in their own defense, and called forth a Roman Catholic literature, upon which even the Protestant world looks with respect, the Italian priesthood have remained as ignorant as ever of the irresistible force which lies hid in the critical and scientific school of modern days. Those who are appointed by the Pope the censors of the theological literature of the world show themselves entirely unfit for such a position, and frequently condemn prominent Catholic writers on the ground of mistranslated passages of their work. Thus it was shown in the case of Dr. Hermes, one of the leading theologians of Catholic Germany, whose system was condemned at Rome some thirty years ago, that the translation made in Rome of the obnoxious doctrines was such as every German would pronounce entirely incorrect. But all the remonstrances of the friends and disciples of Hermes, among whom were several bishops and a large number of professors of theological faculties, were of no avail. Rome did not take back the condemnation, nor would she concede the possibility of the Pope acting upon an incorrect translation. Many other theologians and philosophers were censured in the course of time, who likewise complained that they were misunderstood in Rome, and that they were charged with doctrines which they had never professed. Some of them, nevertheless, submitted to the sentence of Rome, while others separated from the Roman communion. Last autumn an important move was made by a large number of divines of unquestionable orthodoxy, and even of moderately ultramontane principles, which filled the Roman powers with the most serious apprehensions. Under the presidency of Dr. Döllinger, the first theologian of Germany and probably the first of the entire Catholic Church, a congress of Catholic scholars met and discussed the whole question of the relationship between theology and science in an unmistakably liberal and modern spirit. The Pope at once took the alarm, but was quieted by the address adopted at the congress and by the report of the Archbishop of Munich. Nevertheless before the year was out he addressed a brief to the archbishop, in which he claims for scholastic and received opinions, and for decisions of the Roman tribunals, the same absolute obedience which, in theory, is demanded only for the express dogmas of Trent. In fact he urges onward that open antagonism between scientific discovery and traditional or canonical opinions which was forced upon Galileo three hundred years ago.

This brief of the Pope is an event of more than ordinary importance in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church, for it is likely to widen more than ever the breach between all that is progressive within the Church and the Papal authority. As far as Germany is concerned, the comments of the Catholic press on the congress clearly showed that nearly all the Catholic scholars and writers of the country were in sympathy with the congress. The spirit of the latter may be seen in the following resolutions, which, after a discussion lasting four days and conducted with unwonted eloquence and ability, was unanimously adopted:

"1. A close adhesion to revealed truth, as taught in the Catholic Church, is an important and indispensable condition of the progressive development of a true and comprehensive speculation generally, and in particular of victory over the errors that now prevail.

"2. It is a matter of conscience for all who stand on the basis of the Catholic faith to submit in all scientific investigations to the dogmatic utterances of the infallible authority of the Church. This submission to authority is not in contradiction to the freedom natural and necessary to science."

In reading these resolutions it must appear strange that the most intolerant censor should not be satisfied with the emphatic expressions of an unconditional submission to the authority of the Pope. Nevertheless, the reference to the freedom of science kindled the wrath of the Pope, who castigates in his brief the learned scholars without restraint. The following are some of the most salient points of this remarkable document:

"We could not help being extraordinarily astonished at seeing the convocation of the above-mentioned congress made and published in the name of some individuals, in such a manner that nothing is to be found which came from the impulsion, from the authority, and from the mission of the ecclesiastical power, to which alone it belongs, by proper and natural right, to watch over and direct doctrine, particularly in matters relating to theological questions. Certainly this is a thing, and you know it, quite new, and altogether unusual in the Church."

"We cannot conceal that we have suffered considerable uneasiness; for we fear lest the example of this congress, assembled without ecclesiastical authority, may serve by degrees to bring about an attack on the right of spiritual government and of legitimate teaching, which, in virtue of the divine institution, belongs of right to the Roman Pontiff and to the bishops who are in union and in accord with the successor of St. Peter; and that by reason of this trouble thus introduced into the government of the Church, the principle of unity and of obedience in matters of faith may one day be weakened among many. We feared also that in the same congress there might come to be uttered and sustained opinions and systems which, especially by the publicity which would be given to them, might place in peril the purity of Catholic doctrine and the duty of submission."

"Even when the submission due to the divine faith is the only question, it is not to be restricted to those points which have been defined by express decrees of œcumenical councils or Roman Pontiffs and of this Apostolic See; it would be necessary further to extend it to all which is transmitted as divinely revealed by the ordinary body of instruction of the whole Church dispersed over the universe, and which, for this reason, Catholic theologians, with universal and constant consent, regard as belonging to faith. But as the question is of the submission which is due in conscience from all those Catholics who give themselves to the study of the speculative sciences in order to procure to the Church new advantages by their writings, the members of the congress ought to recognize that it is not sufficient for Catholic savans to accept and respect the dogmas of the Church of which we have just spoken, but that they ought also to submit themselves both to the doctrinal decisions which emanate from pontifical congregations, and to the points of doctrine which by common and constant consent are held in the Church as truths."

It is sufficiently evident from the terms of the letter that the Pope is not only seriously alarmed at the results arrived at by the congress, but that he and his advisers dread still more the permanent establishment of any such independent power within the Church. According to its present plan, the congress is to assemble annually for the discussions of questions connected with the welfare of the Church. The Pope accordingly condemns the very notion of such a conference as unauthorized, having been assembled without the express authority of the Holy See. He thinks it calculated to injure the integrity of the faith, as well as to weaken the implicit obedience which Catholics of every order owe to the authority of the Church.

Art. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The large circulation which the work of Renan has found in France and elsewhere is probably the chief motive which has induced Dr. Strauss to prepare likewise a work on the same subject for the people, (*Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk.* Leipzic, 1864.) Strauss has over Renan the advantage of greater learning. He was one of the first who, by attacks upon the authenticity of the Gospel record and the divinity of Christ, gave an impulse to the extensive critical literature of the last thirty years on the New Testament and on the primitive history of Christianity. Though removed from the theological chair of a Protestant university and from the pulpit of the Church, in both of which a man of his views had certainly no right to remain, Dr. Strauss has evidently continued to devote a great deal of time to reading the recent literature of the New Testament,

and to continuing in general his own investigations. The fruit of these studies he gives in the volume above referred to. The book bears on its face the signs of great learning and profound study, and on this account is likely to produce a more lasting impression than the work of Renan. On the other hand, the Frenchman is much superior to the German in point of style; and it is already evident that the work of Strauss will have nothing like the circulation of Renan's work.

The present position of Strauss with regard to the origin of Christianity does not materially differ from that which he held thirty years ago. The report which was circulated some months ago about his conversion was without any foundation. He still denies the historical character of most of the events in the life of Jesus and the primitive history of Christianity. Yet he is compelled to make important concessions to the many apologetic works which have been published since the appearance of his larger Life of Jesus, in 1835.

The stock of literature on the Waldenses has received an addition by a new critical edition of the old catechisms of the Waldensians and the Bohemian Brethren, (*Die Katechismen der Waldenser und Böhmischen Brüder.* Erlangen, 1863,) by Dr. von Zezschwitz, accompanied by learned essays on the relation of these two denominations to each other and to the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. The author thinks that the origin of the Waldensian catechism falls about into the year 1498, and that it was made use of in the compilation of that of the Bohemian Brethren. The latter, according to the opinion of Zezschwitz, was compiled between 1520 and 1522; and only the second part, distinguished from the first by long and intricate answers, proceeds from Lucas of Prague, who hitherto has been commonly regarded as the author of the whole catechism.

The recent attacks upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity continue to call forth a number of popular apologetic works. "Six Lectures on the Person of Jesus Christ," (*Sechs Vorträge über die Person Jesu Christi.* Ingoldstadt, 1863,) delivered in Stuttgard by Herman Weiss, are recommended in the theological papers of Germany as very able.

A Protestant clergyman at Speyer, Bavaria, Th. Culman, has commenced the publication of a new manual of Christian Ethics, (*Die Christliche Ethik.* Stuttgardt, 1864, vol. I,) from a novel point of view. He is an ardent partisan of the peculiar mystic philosophy and theology ("theosophy") which recognizes its chief representatives in Jacob Böhme, Baader, Schelling, (his second system,) and Schaden. He defines ethics as the science of asceticism, or the science of the Christian rules of life, by the observance of which mankind are redeemed from sin and perfected into the image of God.

A new popular biography of Calvin has been published in honor of the tercentenary of his death, by Paul Pressel; (*Johann Calvin.* Elberfeld, 1864.) The author is already favorably known by other works on the history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

A fourth volume of Polenz's "History of French Calvinism," the best work on the Reformed Church of France, is also announced. It continues the history of French Calvinism to the death of Henry IV.

One of the most important works in Roman Catholic literature of Germany is the "History of the Apologetic and Polemical Literature of Christian Theology," by Dr. Werner, (*Geschichte der Apologetischen und Polemischen Literatur der Christlichen Theologie.* Schaffhausen.) The third volume has recently appeared.

Another Roman Catholic work on Church history is a monograph on "Hilarius of Poictiers, one of the prominent Bishops of the Church of the Fourth Century," by Professor Reinkens.

A new collection of Essays on some of the most difficult passages of the Old Testament has been published by F. Böttcher, (*Neue Exegetisch-Kritische Aehrenlese zum Alte Testamente.* Leipzig, 1864.) The work will be completed in three parts. A similar work, published by the same author in 1849, has secured for him the reputation of an able exegetical writer.

FRANCE.

The literature on the History of French Protestantism, of which we gave a survey in the last number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, has recently

received a very valuable addition by a work by Professor de Felice, of Montauban, on the "History of the National Synods of the Reformed Churches of France." (*Histoire des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France.* Paris, 1864.) The work contains forty chapters. The first contains a brief and lucid survey of the entire subject. The second is a comprehensive sketch of the condition of the Reformation in France until the first National Synod. It is followed by three chapters, on "The First National Synod, held at Paris in 1559;" "Some Remarks on the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches," and a "Brief Summary of their Discipline." The following twenty-seven chapters trace the History of the National Synods to 1659, the time when an interruption of sixty-six years commences, which forms the subject of the thirty-fourth chapter. In the next four chapters (thirty-four to thirty-seven) the eighth national synods held in the Desert from 1726 to 1763 are treated of. In the thirty-eighth chapter we find a new interruption of eighty-five years. The thirty-ninth chapter is devoted to the Protestant General Assembly, which met at Paris in 1848. The fortieth, and concluding chapter, contains a recapitulation of the whole, and the inferences which the author draws from the history of the synods. Each of the chapters devoted to the history of one of the synods consists of two parts, the history of the synod being preceded by a survey of the chief political events of the time in which the synod met.

The work of Professor de Felice has a special importance at a time when the ministers and laity of the Reformed Church are almost unanimously memorializing the French government for the restoration of the General Synod.

Pastor Puaux, the author of a History of the French Reformation, in six volumes, has published a popular "Life of Calvin," (*Vie de Calvin. Paris*, 1864,) in honor of the tercentenary of the death of the great Geneva Reformer. Of Merle d'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in Europe at the time of Calvin," (*Histoire de la Reformation du Europe, au temps de Calvin.*) the third volume has been published. The Geneva Committee on Religious Publications has issued, in honor of the tercentenary, a new popular edition of "Bungener's Life of Calvin." "The Life of Calvin," by Theodore Beza, has also been published in a new edition, and called forth a very unfair article in the *Journal des Debats*, from Sylvester de Sacy.

The agitation produced by the work of Renan still continues. Renan himself has issued a popular edition of his work for the masses of the people, which has likewise found a very extensive circulation. Another writer of the same school, Mr. Peyrat, has published an "Elementary and Critical History of Jesus." (*Histoire Elementaire et Critique de Jesus.*) Among the best new works written against Renan are that of Father Gratry, one of the most respected French writers on philosophy, and one of the first pulpit orators of France, and Abbé Freppel, already favorably known by several works on the primitive history of Christianity. Guizot is also reported to have prepared a work directed against Renan, under the title of "Religious Meditations."

E. de Pressensé, the learned editor of the *Revue Chretienne*, is one of the most prolific as well as the ablest writers of French Protestantism. His latest work on the "Church and the French Revolution" (*L'Eglise et la Revolution Française*) has been received with great applause by the literary press. His work is a History of the Relation of Church and State, from 1789 to 1802. It is divided into four books, whose contents are as follows: Book I. "The Constituent Assembly; Debates on Religious Liberty, on Church Property, on the Civil Constitution and the Oath Imposed upon the Clergy; Effects of these Measures in the Country." Book II. "The Religious Contest during the time of the Legislative Assembly and the Convention, in these assemblies and among the people." Book III. "The Regime of the Separation of Church and State; Restoration of the Altars." Book IV. "The Concordat; Its Religious Bearing and its Effects."

"The Idea of God and its new Critics" (*L'Idee de Dieu et ses nouveaux Critiques*) is the title of a new book published by Mr. Caro, already known by a number of other philosophical works. Mr. Caro belongs to what is called in France the new "Spiritualist School," which, in opposition to Pantheism and

Materialism, defends the personality of God and the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Descartes, Malebranche, Fenelon, Bossuet, Laromiguière, Cousin, Jouffroy, Jules Simon, Saisset, are among the writers whom the author regards as the main pillars of the spiritualist school, and whose arguments he defends and supports.

The "Spiritualist School," of which Mr. Caro is one of the representatives, has, of course, nothing in common with what we generally understand by "Spiritualism." This latter school has, however, also found some followers in France, among whom is Mr. Caselli, who published last year a volume, entitled "Reality, or the Agreement of Spiritualism with Principles and Facts." (*Realité; ou, Accord du Spiritualism avec les Principles et les Faits. Paris*, 1863.)

Mr. F. Huet, a chief representative of the Gallican party in the Roman Catholic Church of France, has issued a work in two volumes, entitled "The Science of the Spirit," (*La Science de l'Esprit.*) In this work, which the author says is the fruit of twenty-five years of study, the author unites into one system all the parts of the Science of the Spirit, hitherto dismembered into several distinct sciences under the names of metaphysics and logic, psychology and ethics. Mr. Huet had previously written works on the "Social Influence of Christianity," an "Essay of Catholic Reforms," a "History of the Life and the Works of Bordas Demoulin," his fellow-laborer in behalf of reforms in the Catholic Church. He warmly defends the principal tenets of a Christian philosophy, in opposition to the attacks of modern anti-Christian schools.

Art. X. —SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Quarterly Church Review, April, 1864. (New York.)—1. Intercommunion of the Eastern and Anglican Churches. 2. The Two Theories of Civilization. 3. Positivism. 4. Some Thoughts about so-called Grecian Churches. 5. The Outwardness of our Popular Religion. 5. American Lutheranism and the Episcopacy. 7. Private Munificence in Parishes and Church Charities. 8. The Fulton-street Prayer-Meeting and the Daily Service. 9. Ante-Revolutionary Church and Clergy.

American Presbyterian and Theological Review, April, 1864. (New York.)—1. The Messiah's Second Coming. 2. The Political Principles of the Old Testament Prophets. 3. The Antiquity of Man. 4. Bulgarian Literature. 5. The Principles of Morell's Philosophy. 6. Paul's Allegorical use of the Mosaic Narrative. 7. Theories of the Inspiration of the Scriptures.

Danville Review, March, 1864. (Danville, Ky.)—1. The Nature and Extent of Church Authority. 2. The Nation's Success and Gratitude. 3. Baptist Revision of the Bible. 4. The Loyalty Demanded by the Present Crisis. 5. Disloyalty in the Church. 6. The Men of Danville. No. I. 7. New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

Evangelical Quarterly Review, April, 1864. (Gettysburgh, Pa.)—1. The Patriarchs of the Lutheran Church from Halle. 2. Instruction in Christian Doctrine according to the System of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By John Henry Kurtz, D.D., Professor in the University of Dorpat. Translated from the Sixth German Edition. 3. Paul, the Missionary Apostle. 4. The Christ of History. 5. The Battle of Gettysburgh. 6. The Confessors and the Confession of Augsburg.

7. Revivals. 8. Inspiration. Translated from Zeller's "Biblisches Worterbuch." 9. Lange's Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the New Testament.

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1864. (Dover, N. H.)—1. The Physician of the Body, and the Physician of the Mind. 2. Life and Times of Paul. 3. The Effects of the Fall upon Creation. 4. The Elements of Error in Human Life. 5. Geology and Revelation. 6. God among the Nations. 7. The Anglo-Saxon Church.

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1864. (New Haven.)—1. The Conflict with Skepticism and Unbelief. Second Article: The Mythical Theory of Strauss. 2. The Atonement as a Revelation. 3. Poland. 4. The Atonement. 5. What makes a Heretic? 6. America Vindicated by an Englishman. A Review of Rev. Dr. J. W. Massie's New Book on the United States. 7. Review of the Autobiography of Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher. 8. Review of Weiss's Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker. 9. Charles Beecher's New Theory of the Work of the Redeemer.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Works of Plato. 2. Latin Christianity. 3. Man's Place in Nature. 4. Thoughts of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. 5. The Superintendence of Foreign Missions. 6. Governor Winthrop. 7. St. Jerome.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1864. (Andover, Mass.)—1. The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. 2. Charles Wesley and Methodist Hymns. 3. The Author of the Apocalypse. 4. Final Cause of Varieties. 5. Examination of Phil. iii, 11, and Rev. xx, 4. 6. Rise and Progress of Monasticism. 7. Egyptology, Oriental Travel and Discovery.

The fourth is a brief but valuable article by Prof. Chadbourne, of Williams College, showing, especially with regard to vegetable species, that while abundant provisions are made clearly intended for the behoof of the species, there is a large surplusage as clearly intended for other benefit; especially for man, both as a physical and as an intellectual being. The potato, apple, and parsnip lay in provision more ample than their own needs, as if bound to provide for somebody besides themselves, and man is mostly the only pensioner that obtains their bounty. And the variations herein are produced for man by man, and are in the direction for his life and gratification. The rose varies, under man's cultivation, in the direction of beauty, sacrificing her own seeding—by a beautiful martyrdom—to develop and gratify his esthetic nature. Variation is, indeed, not so much *of* species as *in* species, there being probably limits which the specific vital force can never pass. But if there be no such limits then there is a limitless progress, both of the subservient and dominant species, of nature and of man, onward and upward beyond any assignable terminus. He is decisive against the Darwinian philosophy.

> We consider the scientific discussion as to how animals and plants came upon this globe to be a matter of investigation as to facts. How that question will be ultimately decided we have no doubt. Biologists can throw light upon many dark points, but it is upon geology that we must mainly rely for facts. We have not yet seen any strong argument made out, nor do we believe that geology has yet given one whisper of satisfactory testimony in favor of the development theory. . . . We regard, then, the law of variation as a means of preserving the

species under certain circumstances, and as a means of better fitting created things for their various uses, and not as the creator of the thing, nor in any sense the originator of the species. Variation is the quality of a species, and not its producer.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1864. (New York.)—1. The Giobertian Philosophy. 2. Stevens on Reconstruction. 3. Abolition and Negro Equality. 4. The Next President. 5. Reade's Very Hard Cash. 6. Military Matters and Men.

Dr. Brownson in his first article introduces us to the philosophy of Gioberti, which he considers as superior to any existing system in expounding the validity of the objective world, and the coequal authority as well as harmony of reason and revelation. Gioberti affirms that *knowing* is true *knowing*, because the knowing intuition is not "the product of reason, but really constitutive of it, creating man and enabling him to *know* by giving him *à priori* the faculty and the object of science." If man, then, really *knows* the external world, there is no demand for proving its reality. All the result any reasoning can give is attained without reasoning. If man knows his own *self*, the syllogism of Des Cartes, *Cogito ergo sum*, is superserviceable. Gioberti identifies reason and revelation by showing that "the intelligible and superintelligible" are not separate and two, but a lower and an upper ONE. In the following argument against Des Cartes Dr. Brownson furnishes an exact parallel to Edwards's celebrated reasoning against the freedomist's self-determining power, namely, that a will cannot freely choose without choosing to choose, and choosing to choose to choose, in endless series. "If the simple knowing is not to be taken as certain till it is confirmed by something more ultimate, the fact of consciousness itself becomes uncertain, for consciousness itself becomes uncertain; for consciousness, or what the schoolmen call the *sensus intimus*, is only *knowing*. How do we know that we know that we have the internal affection? I think, therefore I am. But how do I know that I think? I think I think. But how do I know that I think I think? Thus we go on questioning forever, and can never get beyond the simple fact of knowing."

English Reviews.

THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1864. (London.)—1. Shakspeare. 2. Mr. Gladstone's Financial Statements. 3. Revealed Truth—Some of its Characteristics. 4. London Politics in the Thirteenth Century. 5. Trust Deeds and Religious Liberty. 6. Our National Sea Songs. 7. The Crawley Court-Martial. 8. The Privy Council Judgment. 9. On Degenerations in Man. 10. Foreign Affairs—Europe and America.

THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, April, 1864. (London.)—1. Africa and the Church. 2. Froude's Reign of Elizabeth. 3. Bishop Burnet and his Publications. 4. The Use and Abuse of Female Sentiment in Religion.

5. Memoir of Bishop Mackenzie. 6. New Zealand, as it Was and as it Is. 7. Intercommunion with the Eastern Church. 8. The Recent Judgment.

London Quarterly Review, (Wesleyan,) April, 1864.—1. Life in Deep Seas. 2. Robert Browning. 3. Bates's Naturalist on the Amazons. 4. The Ancestry of the Wesleys. 5. Captain Speke's Journal. 6. The Reign of Elizabeth. 7. Shakspeare. 8. Renan's Life of Jesus.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, April, 1864. (London.)—1. The Sepulcher in Sychem. 2. The Typical Character of David: with a Digression concerning certain Words. 3. Selections from the Syriac. No. I.—The Chronicle of Edessa. 4. Cornelius the Centurion. 5. The Trumpet of the Soul sounding to Judgment. A Sermon by Henry Smith. 6. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. 7. On the Nature of Man. 8. The Epistle of Barnabas: from the Codex Sinaiticus. 9. The Decipherment of Cuneiform Inscriptions Described and Tested. 10. An Inquiry respecting the Origin of the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. 11. Water Supply of Jerusalem—Ancient and Modern.

The article on the Nature of Man has the following passage:

It may be worth while also to notice that what human nature is, is not in the least affected by any theory of the origin of species. The hypothesis, for example, of Mr. Darwin may or may not be compatible with the first chapters of Genesis, but it neither increases nor diminishes the nobleness of that human nature which belongs to existing men and women. The silly caricatures of Mr. Darwin's theory which have amused so many ignorant public meetings, and disgraced so many platform orators, bear no kind of resemblance to his theory itself. But if his wise and modest hypothesis were, in fact, the silly dogmatism which even the most ignorant bigot finds it quite easy to refute, it would make not the smallest difference to human nature. It is quite easy to distinguish even the varieties of existing animals, and much more easy to distinguish (at least the most prominent members of) what have hitherto been considered the different species of animals. No one mistakes a grayhound for a terrier, or a lion for an oyster; and if man had been slowly developed from a sponge or a weed, by a process of which even the very traces have been obliterated in the course of innumerable ages, he would still be man, and not either a weed or a sponge. In a word, what we are is not altered by the remotest of our antecedents any more than by the nearest; nor are the strength of body and robust intelligence of a full-grown man in the least dishonored by the utter helplessness of infancy. Whatever may be the physical difficulties of Mr. Darwin's theory, it has certainly not a single moral difficulty which is not to be found also in that region which lies between the germ and the maturity of each separate individual; and nothing can be more foolish or short-sighted than those angry discussions which at any rate seem to imply that the chief differences between a man and a beast are to be found not in his spirit, but in his body.—P. 77.

National Review, April, 1864. (London.)—1. The Apocalypse of St. John. 2. Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy's Letters. 3. The Provincial Assemblies of France. 4. Ireland. 5. Charles the Bold. 6. The Races of the Old World. 7. The Germanic Diet. 8. Sterne and Thackeray. 9. Early History of Messianic Ideas.

The first article in this able rationalistic Review decides that the Apocalypse is the work of the Apostle John, while the fourth Gospel is not. It holds that the Apocalypse is inspired with the elevated spirit of Christianity, but is a prophecy of the destruction of secular Rome by the advent of Christ then impending. The article on Races furn-

ishes a historical survey of races from the Abbeville flint chippers early in the drift period to the present day. The article on Messianic Ideas, assuming that the extant book of Enoch was published before the birth of Christ, maintains that it exhibits the then existing state of the Jewish mind on the subject of the Messiah, and so shows how the New Testament grows out of them. It is more foolish than Renan's book.

German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Historic Theology.) 1864. Third number. 1. PH. SCHAFF, History, Genius, and Significance of the Heidelberg Catechism. 2. LAURENT, The Moravians of our Days. 3. KAPP, the Christianization of Moravia. 4. WATTENBACH, The Religious Condition of Silesia under Austrian Rule.

The tercentenary celebration of the introduction of the Heidelberg Catechism, the standard theological work of the Reformed Churches of Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and France, and their branches, the German and Dutch Reformed Churches in this country, has called forth quite a literature, especially in the German Reformed Church, which has celebrated that event with greater solemnity than any other branch of the Reformed Church. The above article of Professor Schaff is both interesting and exhaustive, as we are accustomed to find all the works of the learned professor, who, as a Church historian, has no superior among all the theologians now living. It treats—after some introductory statements on the various editions of and the works on the Catechism—of the time, occasion, and object of its preparation; gives biographical sketches of Frederic III., Elector of the Palatinate, the patron, and Ursinus and Olevianus, the authors of the Catechism; then passes over to the history of its compilation, its publication, reception, and spreading; and finally discusses its significance and theological character, giving also the opinions of prominent theologians respecting its value, and comparing it with the catechism of Luther. A concluding chapter refers to the arrangements which the German Reformed Church of this country had made for the tercentenary celebration of the introduction of the catechism, in 1863.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) 1864. Third Number. 1. WIESELER, Description of the Codex Sinaiticus. 2. VILMAR, The Symbolic Significance of the Nazarean Vow. 3. LAURENT, Critical Remarks on the Epistles of the Apostle Paul. 4. ZYRO, Remarks on Hebrews ii, 14. 5. RIEHM, Review of Weiss's Johanneischer Lehrbegriff, [The Doctrinal System of the Apostle John]. 6. BINDSEIL, Review of the new complete edition of Calvin's Works, edited by Baum, Canitz, and Reuss.

In the first article Professor Wieseler gives a minute description of the peculiarities of the celebrated Codex Sinaiticus, as compared with

other ancient manuscripts of the Bible. He also refers to the history of the codex, and to the pretensions of the well-known Greek forger of ancient manuscripts, Simonides, who, in a letter to the London *Guardian*, in 1862, made the audacious assertion that the Codex Sinaiticus was no old manuscript at all, but was compiled by him, Simonides, in 1839, from a modern Greek Bible, revised in comparison with some ancient manuscripts and the testimonies of the fathers. Wieseler regards the reply of Tischendorf in his pamphlet, Die Anfechtungen der Sinai Bibel, (Attacks upon the Sinai Bible, 1863,) as completely conclusive. With regard to the age of the codex, Wieseler agrees with Tischendorf that it cannot be fixed later than the fifth century, and that it even may belong to the fourth. Wieseler considers it probable that its origin is coeval with that of the Codex Vaticanus.

The author of the third article maintains that the chronological order of the Epistles of the Apostle Paul is as follows: 1. Second Thessalonians, from Berea, summer of 49. 2. First Thessalonians, from Corinth, 51. 3. Galatians, from Ephesus, 53. 4. First Corinthians, from Ephesus, 55. 5. Second Corinthians, from Macedonia, 55. 6. Romans, from Corinth, 56. 7. Philemon, from Cesarea, between 56 and 58. 8. Colossians, from Cesarea, between 56 and 58. 9. Ephesians, from Cesarea, between 56 and 58. 10. Philippians, from Rome, 59. 11. First Timothy, from Macedonia, 61. 12. Titus, during the voyage from Crete to Nicopolis, 61. 13. Second Timothy, from Rome, 63. The author gives at length his reasons for this arrangement, so far as the epistles to the Thessalonians are concerned.

Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie. (Yearbooks of German Theology.) 1864. First Number. 1. Laemmert, Contributions to a Revised Symbolism of Biblical Numbers. 2. Weiss, The Discourses contained in Matthew. 3. Kloepper, The Meaning of the Parable, Mark iv. 26–29. 4. Steitz, The Signification of the Mediæval Formula, "*Obligare ad Peccatum.*"

Second Number. 1. The Question of Miracles Examined in the Light of Modern Science. 2. Weingarten, Richard Baxter and John Bunyan. 3. Auberlen, Thomas Wizenman.

The fourth article in the first number treats of a mediæval Latin phrase, the correct translation of which has long been a subject of animated dispute, and which has played a prominent part in the history of violent theological controversies. The constitution of the order of Jesuits contains this important passage: "Nullas constitutiones, declarationes, vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse *obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale* inducere, nisi Superior *ea* in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel in virtute obedientiæ juberet." Whoever is unacquainted with the Church Latin of the Middle Ages, and reads the above passage cursorily, will be tempted to translate it, "that no constitutions, declara-

tions, or any statute of living, can involve an obligation *to* a mortal or venial sin, unless the Superior should command them (*the mortal or venial sin*) in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of obedience." Thus the distinguished historian Ranke, in his work on the Roman Popes, (Die Römischen Päpste, first edition, 1834, p. 220;) Reuchlin, in his classic work on Jansensism, (Port Royal, vol. 1, 1839, p. 38;) and Sylvester Jordan, in his work on the Jesuits, (Die Jesuiten, 1839, p. 63,) understood and translated the passage. But Ranke, in the second edition of his work, (1838,) abandoned this translation, and admitted that it was more reasonable to take, as the Roman Catholic writers have always done, this word "*obligatio ad peccatum*" in the meaning of "an obligation involving a sin," thus giving to the above the signification that none of the rules of the order so bind the members that the non-observance by itself involves a sin, but that a sin is committed only when a member violates a general order of the superior. Reuchlin likewise acknowledged his error in a new work on Pascal, (Pascal's Leben, 1840, p. 110.) One of the best German writers against the principles of the Jesuits, Ellendorf, (Die Moral und Politik der Jesuiten, 1840,) also gave the correct translation. Gieseler, in his great work on Church History, (vol. 3, ii, p. 535 *seq.*,) adduced a number of examples from medieval monastic works, to show that the phrase "*obligare ad peccatum*" was everywhere used in the signification of an obligation (the non-observance of) which involves a sin. Since then, nearly all the German writers of note put the right construction upon the phrase, except Professor Jacobs of Halle, who, in his pamphlet on the Jesuits, (1862,) took up the interpretation which Ranke had first adopted but afterward abandoned. Dr. Weicker, in his work on the School-System of the Jesuits according to the Statutes of the Order, (Das Schulwesen der Jesuiten, 1863, pp. 282–288,) gives an essay of six pages on the meaning of the phrase, in which he adopts himself the correct translation, though he gives so many arguments for the contrary opinion as to leave the impression that he considered the true meaning to be doubtful.

Dr. Steitz, of Frankfort, thinks it therefore opportune to examine again the meaning of the words "obligare ad peccatum" in the Latin of the middle ages; and he treats of the whole subject in so lucid and exhaustive a manner as to remove the last doubt about the true meaning of the Jesuitical phrase. But while he exonerates the Jesuits from a crime with which they have been charged through insufficient acquaintance with medieval Latin, he at the same time clearly establishes the dangerous and demoralizing character of the blind obedience which the superiors of the Jesuits, as well as those of nearly all the monastic orders, demand from all the members of these orders.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE.—*February* 15.—1. PRESSENSE, The Religious Bearing of the Concordat. 2. ROLLER, Italy and the Italians. 3. PUAUX, The Death of Louis XIV. 4. ROSSEUUW ST. HILAIRE, Conferences on the Life of Jesus.

March 15.—1. ROSSEUUW ST. HILAIRE, The Duke of Alva in Flanders. 2. BERSIER, A New Commentary [by F. Godet] on the Gospel of St. John. 3. GUERLE, The Future of the Liberal Party.

April 15.—1. KUHN, the Unpublished Letters of Sismondi. 2. HOLLARD, The Monologues of Schleiermacher. 3. ROSSEUUW ST. HILAIRE, The Church and the Revolution. 4. BERSIER, The Causes of the Deposition of Adolphe Monod.

The Protestant papers of France have had recently an interesting discussion on the deposition, in 1832, of Rev. Adolphe Monod, the great French pulpit orator, by the Consistory of Lyons. As the rationalistic party are charging the Presbyterial Council of Paris with intolerance for having dismissed the Rev. Athanase Coquerel, jr., (to which case we refer more fully in our department of Religious Intelligence,) they are reminded that in 1832 a rationalistic consistory dismissed one of the most gifted preachers of the Church for preaching against "unworthy communions," and for demanding that the Consistory should take measures for having all the persons wishing to take the communion examined, in order to exclude those whose lives did not correspond to their profession of faith. It appears that Mr. Martin-Paschaud, the same rationalistic pastor whose suffragan Mr. Athanase Coquerel, jr., was until his recent dismission, was at that time member of this Consistory of Lyons. The comments on this fact by the Protestant press of France have called forth a letter from Mr. Martin-Paschaud, in his organ, ("Le Disciple du Jesus Christ,") in which he gives a very detailed account of the occurrence. It appears from this account that the two reasons above stated were the only ones adduced by the consistory for the act of deposition, and not the subsequent refusal of Monod to distribute the Lord's supper, though this latter act is mentioned in the decision by which the government (the celebrated Cuvier at that time was charged with the administration of the Protestant worship) confirmed the deposition.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*February* 1, 1864.—1. QUATREFAGES, Natural History of Man: The Polynesians and their Migrations. 2. D'ASSIER, The "Mato Virgem," Scenes and Reminiscences of a Journey in Brazil. 4. MAZADE, "Le Maudit," a Novel on the Religious Habits of France. 5. FORGUES, Cotemporaneous English Novels. 6. REVILLE, The Ancestors of the Europeans in Ante-historic Times: the Arian People according to Modern Science. 7. E. DU HAILLY, The French Antilles and Liberty of Commerce.

February 15.—3. QUATREFAGES, Natural History of Man, (second article.) The Origin and Migration of the Polynesians. 4. E. RECLUS, The Poetry and the Poets of South America since its Independence. 5. LANGEL,

Philosophical Studies in England: Herbert Spencer. 9. L. DE LAVERGNE, The Elections of 1789.

March 1.—1. ESQUIROS, England and English Life, (twenty-third article.) 6. MONTEGUT, Historical and Moral Character of Don Quixote. 9. WOLOWSKI, The Finances of Russia.

March 15.—2. F. LENORMANT, Greece since the Revolution of 1862. 4. PAYEN, Chemical Industry in the Nineteenth Century.

April 1.—1. PAVIE, Devadata, Scenes of Hindoo Life. 5. E. DE LAVELEYE, Rural Economy in the Netherlands. 6. AMPERE, End of Liberty at Rome. 7. MAZADE, Liberal Ideas and Modern Literature.

April 15.—1. SAINTE BEUX, Sketches of Cotemporaneous Poets. 3. L. DE LAVERGNE, The Bank of France and the Banks of the Departments. 5. SAVENCY, The Forces of Italy.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

A History of Christian Doctrine. By WILLIAM T. SHEDD, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 408, 508. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

Dr. Shedd's history has already, we understand, attained a second edition. With his clear, terse, grave style, the expression of stern and positive opinions, aided by Scribner's liberal margins, bold type, and broad spaces, the work affords pleasanter and easier reading than hard theology usually presents. Nor is it by vailing the stern features of his system that Dr. Shedd wins our attention. It is the rich ebony luster that constitutes a main attraction.

His history is professedly history written from a special stand-point, and with an honorable frankness he avows this specialty. "I have felt," he says, "a profound interest in the Nicene trinitarianism, the Augustinian anthropology, and the Anselmic soteriology, and from these centers have taken my departure." As the Augustinian anthropology is pregnant with a doctrine of necessitated will, transferable guilt, and predestination, it is readily seen that Dr. Shedd occupies the stand-point of high Calvinism. The purpose of the work is to present such a view of doctrinal history as shall be soft and easy to a Calvinistic eye. It is a difficult task. That system is no doctrine of the general Church. Taking its origin with Augustine, unknown to the primitive Church, rejected by all the oriental Churches, traceable only as a narrow streak adown the ages of the Western Church, it is condemned by the almost unanimous voice of Christian history. Hence the object of the present work required the sacrifice of all symmetry, the prominent expansion of the narrow and the exceptional, and the flinging the main field into the background. This task Dr. Shedd has performed with masterly skill. His object is of course attained very much by the sacrifice of the claims of the work as history. His pro-

duction can scarce be quoted without distrust as historical authority. It is *polemics;* and viewed as such it is replete with interest, and may occupy an important place in our doctrinal literature. It needs to be *answered* by counter history; and the debate may then be held and the truth be vindicated as effectually upon historical as upon exegetical and logical grounds.

Dr. Shedd constructs his history not so much by Periods as by topics. Each single doctrine is selected, and its history is singly traced from the Christian era to the present day. His topics are, Christian Apologetics; the Trinity, including Christology; Anthropology, including the doctrines of Will and Depravity; Soteriology, including Atonement and Predestination; and Eschatology. It is thus not so much a history as a series of historical dissertations.

Of Augustine, Dr. Shedd's theological idol, we admire rather the great talents and massy volume than the theological soundness. There is scarce a character in Church history from whom we inherit so disastrous a theological legacy. His conversion from Manicheanism seems ultimately to have consisted in slicing away the better half of his double God, and spreading the black deity over the firmament of Christian theology. To his *ingenium atrox* we trace the accursed dogmas of infant damnation, transferred guilt, the identification of depravity with sexual appetite, and predestination. Pelagius was the better man, and not doctrinally the greater heretic. The former relaxed the moral nerve of man; the latter *diabolized* God. The former was a practical rationalist; the severer doctrines of the latter, while they repelled and made infidel the highest reason of man, when fully accepted, resulted often in a self-immolating but reasonless piety, none the less selfish for its self-immolation, resembling the self-consecration of an oriental pantheist. True Christian doctrine lies between the two; is neither Pelagian nor Augustinian; rejects the self-sufficiency and disregard of gracious divine aids of the former, and the God-dishonoring fatalism of the latter. It is this golden mean of true theology which the whole Christian Church of the first three centuries held; which, with minor variations, the great body of the Christian Church, Eastern, Roman, and Protestant, holds; the Protestant, with the exception of those sections which have come under the influence of the Genevan forger of the *decretum horribile.* Dr. Shedd's great art consists in bringing out into monstrous prominence the narrow and exceptional, so that Church doctrinal history consists largely of a history of doctrines which the Church did not hold.

When he comes to the anthropology of the entire Christian Church eastern and western, from the time of the apostles to the time of Augustine, Dr. Shedd is obliged to exert his utmost ingenuity to evade

the undeniable but stupendous fact that all the peculiarities of modern Calvinism are utterly contradicted and condemned, and that the entire Christian body was what would now be considered substantially Arminian. The Eastern Church, Syriac and Greek, he is compelled to surrender outright. Its theology was not far from the sub-Arminianism of Limborch and Curcellæus. Under a prattle about "germs" and "tendencies" to Augustinism in the early Western Church, etc., he endeavors to disguise the fact that its pre-Augustinian theology was not above the level of the Arminianism of Arminius himself. Of this he tells us Augustinism was a development; which is as true as that Princeton theology is a development of Wesleyan theology. Dr. Shedd's phrase, "the Latin or Augustinian theology," is a plump historical mistake. Augustinian theology never was "*the* Latin theology." It was, even in the West, generally the theology of a slim minority of fatalistic ultraists. But what we wish specially to emphasize and spread out for deliberate contemplation and permanent memory is this: Even in the West before the teaching of Augustine the entire Church rejected the doctrine of hereditary guilt, necessitated damnability, irresistible grace, predestination, unfree will, and unconditional election. This whole brood of cockatrice's eggs was hatched in the Church by the evil genius of the fervid African. The primitive Western theology was not the theology of Calvin, nor Twisse, nor Hodge, nor Shedd; but rather of Arminius, of Cranmer, of Wesley, of Watson, of Wilbur Fisk, and of this our Methodist Quarterly Review.

Dr. Shedd's explication of Augustine's doctrine, which is of course his own, abounds with self-contradictions and absurdities, of which we will specify a few.

He confounds again and again the *voluntary* with the volitional. "Voluntariness consists in willing." Vol. ii, p. 58. Now a voluntary act is an act (generally corporeal) in accordance with and *consequent upon* a volition; not the *volition itself*. Hence "voluntariness" does not "consist in willing," but in obeying the will.

Again, Dr. Shedd denies that freedom consists in a "power of contrary choice." That is, a free choice is a choice other than which no choice could be put forth; that is a choice which the agent could not help putting forth. Now how is such a choice any more free than any other event which cannot be helped, or the different of which cannot be, as a clock stroke or waterfall? A *splendid* liberty is that; the liberty of doing what you cannot help doing!

Again, he places much emphasis upon the difference between a depravity of the will and a depravity of the sensibilities. And yet he tells us, (p. 61,) "Voluntariness has not perished in the sinner, because he sins *with delight, and delight is voluntariness.*" If delight

is voluntariness, (volitivity,) then a delight is a volition and the will and sensitivity are one, for delight is a sensitivity. In what consists then the difference between a depraved will and a depraved sensitivity? And how is will any more free than a desire or perception?

Again, he tells us that freedom consists in *uncompelled* self-motion. But how is an act which cannot be avoided otherwise than *compelled;* or at any rate the more free for not being *compelled? Compulsion* to an act can do no more than render it an act which *cannot be helped* or *cannot be otherwise.* Or how is a self-motion which cannot be helped any more free than any other kind of motion? Self-motion or not self-motion, it is still motion that cannot be helped. A caused motion can be nothing more than *a motion the agent cannot help*, and that much the self-motion is. A self-motion that cannot be helped is, if not a compelled self-motion, certainly a necessitated self-motion; and a self-motion necessitatively tacked to me is no more free than a motion caused by a cause other than the self. A necessitated self-moved volition is no more free than a gravitating water-drop.

Again, he elaborately maintains that sinning is a free act because the will creates sin, *de nihilo*, from nothing. But what difference does the material or non-material, wrought upon by the will, make in regard to the freedom of the volition? A volition which cannot be helped, to create out of nothing, is no more free than such a volition to create out of something.

Again, he tells us, (p. 61,) that in the Greek anthropology freedom is "indetermination or indifference." Now no anthropology, Greek, Latin, Dutch, or English, ever held freedom to be "indetermination" itself. It consists, according to the Greek anthropology, in a *power* to will either of several ways; hence, though it may exist in the mind's state of indetermination, and be exerted in the act of passing from that indetermination, yet it is very absurd to say that the freedom is the indetermination itself.

More we might say; but is more needed to show Dr. Shedd's utter failure to master these questions? This results from no deficiency of intellectual power, but from the necessity of his position. Augustinism is inevitably theological self-stultification. None of that narrow school ever dealt with these topics without groping like the blind-struck men of Sodom at the door of Lot.

In regard to Dr. Shedd's direct treatment of Arminianism we can realize that "blessed are those who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed." The random statements contained in his "Discourses" warned us of his unacquaintance with a theology which he imagined himself to be opposing, when, in fact, he was only misunderstanding and misstating. Dr. Shedd's reading, like his writing, has

been one-sided. His studies, like every other man's, have been not universal, but partial, and they have not lain among the great Arminian divines; and his second-hand quotations and misstatements are of the most perturbing nature. He tells us (vol. ii, p. 496) that the writings of Limborch were dogmatical and those of Curcellæus were exegetical; whereas a glance at their pages would have made him say that Limborch is partly exegetical, and Curcellæus wholly dogmatical. A reading of those great Arminians might have prevented his giving Limborchus as the Latin form of Limborch, instead of Limburgius. The name of Curcellæus is spread in capitals on the album page as among his standard Arminian authorities on soteriology, and his book vii is specified as the treatment of that subject; whereas Curcellæus is, we are sorry to say, essentially Socinian on the atonement, and his book vii has nothing to do with the subject. That book is entirely devoted to Christian ethics. What is more amusing still, Dr. Shedd (vol. ii, p. 373) professedly quotes, refutes, and flaunts with a lofty sneer at the soteriology of (as he supposes) Curcellæus, when in fact it is Limborch whom he is really quoting, giving the twenty-second chapter of Curcellæus's Third Book as his authority, when there are not twenty-three chapters in his Third Book; and his Third Book has nothing to do with soteriology. Curcellæus discusses very briefly the atonement in his Fifth Book; and a perusal of that book will show Dr. Shedd that he is no representative of Arminian soteriology, his views being even below the Grotian.

The correctness of his treatment of this point in this passage is about equal to the accuracy of the quoting. Dr. Shedd's words are, (quoting imaginarily Curcellæus, really Limborch, Theologia Christiana, lib. iii, chap. xxii):

"Jesus Christ," says Curcellæus, "may be said to have been punished (*punitus*) in our place, in so far as he endured the greatest anguish of soul, and the accursed death of the cross for us, which were of the nature of a vicarious punishment in the place of our sins,* (*quæ pœnæ vicariæ pro peccatis nostris rationem habuit.*) And it may be said that our Lord satisfied the Father for us by his death, and earned righteousness for us, in so far as he satisfied, not the rigor and exactitude of the divine justice, but the just as well as compassionate will of God, (*voluntati Dei justæ simul ac misericordi,*) and went through all that God required in order to our reconciliation." According to these positions, the sufferings of Christ were not a substituted penalty, but a substitute *for* a penalty. A substituted penalty is a strict equivalent, but a substitute *for* a penalty may be of inferior worth, as when a partial satisfaction is accepted for a plenary one, by the method of acceptilation; or, as if the finite sacrifice of the lamb and the goat should be constituted by the will of God an offset for human transgression. And the term "satisfaction" also is wrested from its proper signification, in that the sufferings of Christ are asserted to be a satisfaction *of benevolence*. "Our Lord satisfied . . . not the rigor and exactitude of divine justice, but the just and *compassionate* will of God," a use of language as solecistical as that which should speak of smelling a sound.—Pp. 372–374.

* What does Dr. Shedd mean by "a vicarious punishment in the place of our sins?"

Now Limborch, whom Dr. Shedd is unknowingly quoting here, really takes the ground that Christ did not suffer infliction either *identical* or *equivalent* to the sinner's true desert, but a *less* accepted by God in the stead of the greater. "So that in this sense," he adds, "Jesus Christ *may be rightly said to be punished* in our stead, inasmuch as he bore for us the accursed death of the cross, which had the nature (*rationem*) of a vicarious punishment for our sins. And in this sense the Lord by his own death can be said to have satisfied the Father for us, and for us to have merited justification inasmuch as he satisfied not the rigor of divine justice, but *the* WILL OF GOD, just and at the same time merciful, and performed all required by God to our reconciliation." Now Dr. Shedd's assertion that the term "satisfaction" is here "solecistically" applied, and that "the sufferings of Christ are asserted to be a satisfaction of benevolence," are palpably incorrect. It is God's "*just will*" which receives the "*satisfaction.*" That *will* is indeed additionally *merciful;* but that mercy is engaged not in demanding satisfaction, but in diminishing the amount of suffering demanded. The mercy cancels just its own amount of the requirement of satisfaction. It is really because the *benevolence* does not require satisfaction that, in Limborch's view, Christ's penal sufferings may be less. If "smelling a sound" be as little "solecistical" to Dr. Shedd's senses as satisfying a just demand lessened by mercy, then his olfactories must be endowed with a vigorous taste for music.

We close our criticisms on this work not because we lack matter, but room. Dr. Shedd's apology for his work on the grounds of want of time for correction we should cheerfully accept, but that we fear that from his theological position greater care would produce little improvement.

A Commentary on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical; embodying for popular use and edification the results of German and English Exegetical Literature, and designed to meet the difficulties of Modern Skepticism. With a General Introduction, treating of the Genuineness, Authenticity, Historic Verity, and Inspiration of the Gospel Records, and of the Harmony and Chronology of the Gospel History. By WILLIAM NAST, D.D. 8vo., pp. 760. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Dr. Nast was requested by the General Conference to furnish a commentary for our American German Methodists, and after some years of hesitation completed the work to the close of Mark. The publication received such commendation in Germany and America as seemed to him an imperative call to furnish an English translation. We have the result, thus far, in a single magnificent volume, doing credit alike to the learning, talent, and industry of the author, and the splendid workmanship of our western publishers. Such a work from

such a quarter is a suggestive fact, that might justify, had we room, some pleasant expatiation.

Dr. Nast has peculiar qualifications for the work. He is pre-eminently *bilingual;* at home on both sides the great Teutonic world; for England and English America, as well as Germany, are Teuton. From beginning to end of his work, we believe not one false idiom will suggest that he is not handling his mother-tongue. He quotes liberally, with honorable credits, from both languages. Olshausen, Stier, Lange, and Ebrard are his favorite Germans. These are indeed now all extant in the English language, but they were not when he commenced his work; and the judiciousness of his selections from them renders his work in some degree a substitute for them.

The work opens with an elaborate Introduction, which is at the same time a treatise of a particular part of Christian evidences. Commencing with the text of the New Testament, it demonstrates, first, that we have a genuine and reliable copy of the original books; second, that the books were written, as claimed, by original eye-witnesses or cotemporaneous historians; and third, that being so genuine and cotemporaneous, they are reliable and *true.* This is followed by an elaborate Synoptical Table and index.

Dr. Nast allows himself full elbow-room and ample scope. The sacred text is by him divided, not by chapters, but into paragraphs; to each paragraph is prefixed an elaborate introduction; the text then appears, in a large and beautiful type; philological and geographical notes are relegated to the foot of the page; a full commentary then follows the text; and a series of homiletical suggestions closes the procession. And so our commentator commences his grand march through the New Testament. It purposes to be a *thesaurus* for the lay reader, for the family, for the minister. Though by no means a compiler, but an independent thinker, Dr. Nast quotes extensive passages from his predecessors in exegetical literature. Trench, Wilson, Alexander, Ellicott, are his favorite English authors. His Homiletical Suggestions are mostly from "The Homilist," a valuable English periodical.

We have a special criticism or two. The "interpretation" quoted upon page 199, of Matthew ii, 23, is hardly "the generally-received" one; it was first introduced into commentary by the commentator quoted, and for it he was indebted to Hengstenberg's theory of prophetic vision. We are also pleased to note that Dr. Nast adopts our view of the Nazarene in Matthew ii, 23, for which also we were much indebted to Hengstenberg. It is not wholly new, but it had been dropped out of commentary; and with due thanks to Hengstenberg, we added new argument in its behalf. Lastly, it is surprising to us

that in his commentary on Matthew xxiv he should apply the epithet "fanciful" to our interpretation. An interpretation which discards all fancy; which simply asks that words may have their ordinary meaning, and that such meaning shall not be arbitrarily changed, but remain permanent in the same discourse; that figures shall be discarded for literality, and double meaning for single meaning; which only asks a blending of different reports into one, and a proper paragraphing and type, may be a faulty interpretation, but it is a queer fancy that styles it "fanciful." Dr. Nast's commentary seems to us, like that of the other modern allegorists, mist and double entendre; depriving the discourse of all value as prophecy against skepticism, furnishing the basis of modern Universalism, and destroying the scripture proof of a future literal judgment day. This we showed at length in an article, some years since, in the Methodist Quarterly Review. This Dr. Nast, perhaps, would realize should he enter into debate with a skillful Universalist, by whom we think any reasoner would be logically floored after the admissions of his interpretation. As to our interpretation involving the premillennial advent, Dr. Nast's weighty but blank *assertion* stands at issue, we think, with our repeated *argumentation*. If that passage, as by us interpreted, implies a premillennial advent, then, as could be easily shown, numerous other passages imply the *then* immediate advent.

But a truce with these specialties. Dr. Nast is prosecuting a noble work for the general Church. To it he tells us he has consecrated his life. With his arduous labors as Coryphæus of our "German work," as editor of our German periodical, as author of our German Commentary, it must take some years for even him, German and giant though he be, to complete the enterprise. We rejoice in the recollection that the age of "giants" was also the age of Methuselahs.

Man All Immortal; or, the Nature and Destination of Man as taught by Reason and Revelation. By D. W. Clark, D.D. 12mo., pp. 464. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Dr. Clark has here presented a volume replete with gems of thought upon a topic of all topics of the highest interest to our humanity. The volume is the full completion of a work first projected as a course of lectures to his students when principal of Amenia Seminary. Years of reading and thought have furnished additional items, and it has now received from the handicraft of Poe & Hitchcock its present handsome embodiment.

Man as soul and body—soul to live forever and body to die for future

resurrection—is his theme. First he investigates in the light of physiology and philosophy the soul as related to higher and lower life, and to the corporeal organism. He shows that mind is not a function of body, but that on the contrary body is the mere organ of mind. He traces the relations of the soul to the senses as the means by it used at its will as avenues for knowing the outer world; whence soul is easily seen to be an independent agent, essentially separable from its external machinery, without any alteration in itself. The distinction is then drawn between instinct and reason. The former is not only "prior to experience and independent of instruction," but without forethought and under guidance of the divine intelligence.

From the nature of soul he proceeds to consider its destiny—Immortality. He argues this first from the indestructibility of all created objects, but does not show how this does not prove the immortality of brute mind. Other arguments adduced as from Universal Consent, and from man's higher faculties, are not liable to the same remark. He next considers Death, the breaking away of the machinery from around the agent, the physiology of the process, the wisely appointed terrors by which death is made repugnant and life is guarded, and the higher phenomena by which the triumphant soul demonstrates her self-hood amid the dissolution of the organism. Next the doctrine of the Intermediate State is duly traced. Soul is maintained, as well as body, to possess the human form, and in the disembodied state it waits the day of Universal Judgment. Intercourse, he believes, may exist between the visible and invisible worlds; though he thinks there is no authentic instance of the appearance of the departed to the living, in which we differ from him. The scriptural and philosophical argument for the Resurrection then follows at full length and with great clearness. The recognition of friends in heaven is maintained. The Memory, (which is shown by striking facts to be indestructible,) combined with Conscience, is the book of retribution and also its executor. The glories of the final Heaven, located doubtless in the central Orb of the Universe, are then unfolded with an eloquence in which Scripture and philosophy blend their wonderful affirmations.

We welcome this noble work as a rich contribution to our religious literature. It is full of points for pulpit amplification, and rich with lessons of priceless interest for the Christian reader. While reading and erudition are laid under ample contribution to supply material, the whole is rendered comprehensible to the plainest understanding, and attractive to the most indolent thinker. It is rich in anecdotal illustration. Truth is thus reduced to concrete form, and the pages

of the volume are invested with a popular interest well calculated to carry the volume into the families of the Church.

The Religion of Childhood; or, Children in their Relation to Depravity, to the Family, and to the Church. By Rev. F. G. Hibbard, D.D. 12mo., pp. 411. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

The writings of the venerated Olin it was which first awakened our thinkers to a discussion of the relations of the child to Christ and the Church. The slight overstatements of some later writers have awakened a spirit of caution, wise in itself, but not intended to silence thought and discussion upon the subject. Whether right in his precise views or not, Dr. Hibbard's spirit is gentle and loyal, his investigation searching, his style clear, and his objects pure. Much is due to him for advances in our discipline and practice in relation to the children of the Church.

Dr. Hibbard, as we understand him, maintains the doctrine of man's natural depravity as thoroughly as any thinker in our Church. He requires just as strictly the evidences of a regenerate state, as condition to admission to the Church's full communion. He thus avoids Pelagian theology and unregenerate Church-membership. Such he holds are the relations of the yet irresponsible child to the atonement, that he is, by the overlying power of the blessed Spirit, in that state which is to him as an infant parallel to what regeneration is to an adult. Whether you apply the term *regenerate* to it or not he thinks of little consequence.

The main omission of Dr. Hibbard's book is of a chapter showing what is "Methodist Theology" on the subject. We would thank some well-read thinker to furnish for our Quarterly a collation of all the passages to be found in our standard authors, from Wesley to Olin, on the gracious status of infants. It is not enough to tell us what are the present prevalent opinions of the majority of Methodists, for denominational opinions often drift away from their own standards and symbols. It is not enough for an editor glibly to tell us that such and such is "Methodist Theology," for we editors, poor fellows, sometimes fail of infallibility. We wish to go back of both current opinion and editorial authority, and learn what the Church is responsible for as "Methodist Theology."

We thank our brethren of the Western Concern for giving this work, "for the author," to the public. We believe every earnest and honest thinker in the Church will desire that the present speaker be candidly heard, and if there be anything contrary to sound doctrine and true godliness in his work, the error be eliminated, and the truth be maintained or adopted.

Lectures and Addresses. By Rev. JOHN DEMPSTER, D.D. With an Appendix, containing the Funeral Sermon and Memorial Services occasioned by the Death of the Author. Edited by Rev. DAVIS W. CLARK, D.D. 12mo., pp. 453. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

This memorial volume will be a welcome gift to the thousands of friends and admirers whom the long and noble career of the author won to love and reverence his person and character. It contains twenty-one public addresses, the flower of his rich and luxuriant nature. So much has been said, and so well, by the contributor of the first article of our present number that we need add no syllable of our own to commend the works of Dr. Dempster to our readers. We trust that much more is yet to come to hand through the press from his manuscripts extant. Especially we think the entire thoughtful body of the Church will desire that his unfinished work on the Will should be given to the public.

The memorial appendix contains the Funeral Sermon, by Dr. Eddy; Dr. Dempster as a Minister, by Rev. F. D. Hemenway, A. M.; as a Missionary, by Dr. Kidder; as a Student and Thinker, by Dr. Bannister; as an Instructor, by Rev. C. H. Fowler, A. M., one of the Alumni of the Garrett Institute; and as a Man of Progress, by Dr. Tiffany. These honors to the sainted dead were paid worthily and well. From Mr. Hemenway we give the following anecdote:

When first stationed in Rochester, N. Y., he received an early call from a prominent Episcopalian clergyman, then resident in that city. In the course of the conversation he remarked, "Mr. Dempster, I am glad to welcome you to our city. Some of your preachers here have been somewhat tinged with fanaticism, but from what I have heard of you, I am sure you will countenance no such proceedings." Said Dr. Dempster, "You have entirely mistaken my character, sir. If I understand your use of the term, I am one of the most fanatical men on the footstool, and I intend to do all in my power to promote such fanaticism in this city." And he was successful; for there commenced under his ministry there such a gracious visitation as was never known besides in the history of that city, the blessed fruits of which are scattered far and wide.

The Two Sabbaths: an Essay showing that the Patriarchal and Christian Sabbath(s?) are one and the same, and that the Jewish Sabbath has been abrogated. By Rev. E. Q. FULLER. 24mo., pp. 101. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

This neat little volume contains many valuable thoughts in regard to the doctrine of the Sabbath expressed in clear and easy style. Upon the special point, however, that the patriarchal Sabbath was upon the first day of the week, we see no Scripture proof whatever. That question is left by our author just where it was; absolutely no question at all for want of data for argument.

Colenso's Fallacies: another Review of the Bishop of Natal. By Rev. C. H. FOWLER, A.M. With an Introductory Essay and Review of Part II. By Rev. HENRY BANNISTER, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Greek Exe-

gesis in the Garrett Biblical Institute. 24mo., pp. 139. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Natal, London, and Evanston imply magnificent distances over which this contest ranges and rages. It is a world-wide question that is under debate. We commend the "Review" of the young champion in Illinois to the attention of our readers. Whether his replies be or be not conclusive, they are at any rate brief.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Das Charakterbild Jesu. Ein Biblischer Versuch. Von Dr. Daniel Schenkel. Second Edition. 8vo., pp. 405. Wiesbaden: 1864.

Amid the flood of books and pamphlets now inundating Germany, touching the life of Christ and his modern biographers, the above deserves, on many accounts, to be singled out for more particular notice. In the first place, Dr. Schenkel is one of the strongest and most influential leaders of the lay representation party now aiming at the consolidation of all the Protestant State Churches into one self-governing democratic organization, and the recasting of the evangelical creed into a form more "consonant with the thought and culture of the age." Perhaps the book will give us some idea of the character of the new phase of Christian belief which he and his party would fain inaugurate. In the second place it has had a flattering reception, a second edition having been called for in a very short time, despite the competing works of *Osterzee*, *Strauss*, (his new *popular* treatise,) *Renan*, etc. Indeed, the author had no time to alter or emend a single paragraph, or hear the verdict of the critics; he could only give us a new unaltered reprint of the first edition. Strauss aspires, in the preface of his new work, after the honor of having written such a life of Jesus for the German people as Renan has for the French, but according to all appearance the palm is more likely to fall to Schenkel, though even he will fall far short of the mark. But we must not take up more space in showing why the work is notable, but proceed *ad rem*. The book is divided into seven sections. The first is introductory, and discusses in two chapters "The Significance of the Person of Christ and the Treatises thereon hitherto," 36 pages. The second section (pp. 36–93) is entitled "The Development;" the third (pp. 93–122) "The First Establishment of a Society;" the fourth (pp. 122–171) "The Messiah;" the fifth (pp. 171–220) "The Field of Operation in Judea;" the sixth (pp. 220–263) "The Crisis;" the seventh (pp. 263–405) "The Consummation;" in all twenty-nine chapters, with an appendix of notes. The author claims that it is the first delineation of Christ's character and deeds on the basis of the second Gospel.

The fourth he rejects from beginning to end, though his opinion of its authorship does not agree with that of the Tübingen critics. Matthew's Gospel he holds to be an outright forgery, and Luke's full of legendary matter. Even Mark's is not wholly free from such elements, inasmuch as *our* Mark is a tinkered-up recension of the original work. Still, as the purest source left to us, we must follow it in preference to all others, and by means of historical criticism, etc., endeavor to elaborate the real facts. He denies the supernatural origin of his hero, but thinks there may be some basis of fact for the account of the disputation with the doctors in the temple. He grants the reality of the wonderful cures, but they were wrought by the natural powers of his "hallowed personality." The real miracles attributed to him, such as the stilling of the storm, feeding the multitude, etc., are products of the excited imagination of the people after his mysterious departure from mortal view. They are "dark shadows" cast upon his fair character by ignorant and infatuated followers. His view of the sources leaves of course ample room for free eclecticism in gleaning up the elements for his "Character-Portraiture," a liberty in which he has indulged to the fullest extent; for example, we are oracularly told that the only authentic word from the cross which we have is, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Why? Because it is all that Mark reports. But when Mark, this exclusively infallible authority, narrates in his eighth chapter the feeding of the multitude, O! that is *mythical* all of a sudden! If Mark had recorded the history of the Annunciation, or of the Lord's *post mortem* apparition to St. Paul, it would have caused our facile doctor no difficulty at all. Such accounts are *of course* mythical. Mark *does* record the Resurrection, but it "is infallibly a later patchwork addition," etc. A very convenient mode of writing history this! From a pretty thorough comparison of this precious production with the new work of Strauss, we are compelled to say, that for arbitrary dogmatical assumption, hopeless prepossession, and cool Iscariotism, this prelate of the Baden "Evangelical Church," this educator of future ministers of our Lord Jesus Christ, quite outstrips his openly infidel compeer. And yet he talks *so* touchingly about "*our Redeemer*," and gives over the powerlessness of "the Church" with the masses, and writes this book *to counteract the awful effects of Renan's!* Associated with hundreds of "like precious faith" in the "*German Protestant Verein*," he is laboring for a revival of religion throughout the fatherland, to be brought about by abolishing consistorial governments and introducing the presbyterian form, only completely democratized. The theology he is intending to introduce into the new "Folks-Church" can be inferred from these hints of his Christology.

Biblischer Commentar über das Alte Testament Herausgegeben von Carl Friedr. Keil und Franz Delitzsch. IV. Theil. *Poetische Bücher.* II. Band. *Das Buch Job.* Leipzig: 1864.

Professors Keil and Delitzsch have undertaken the difficult but exceedingly important task of furnishing us with a continuous commentary on the Old Testament, abreast with the latest results of philological, historical, geographical, and dogmatical investigation, and from the standpoint of Biblical orthodoxy. The present volume, embracing the Book of Job, is the fourth of the series in the order of publication; the first embracing Genesis and Exodus; the second, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; the third, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. These three are from the pen of Dr. Keil, as also a fourth covering the books of Samuel and Kings, now in press. The volume before us on Job is by Dr. Delitzsch, and is soon to be followed by one on Isaiah, also by him. The parts thus far issued have been very favorably received, and in view of the present interest in Old Testament researches both in England and America, will doubtless have large foreign sales.

Restricting our present remarks to the volume before us, we have first to say that it is a closely printed octavo of 543 pages, costing two thaler twenty-four neugroschen. In an appendix Consul Doctor Wetzstein gives us a very interesting Dissertation on "the Monastery of Job in Hauran, and the Job-Legend," illustrated by a map of his tour of exploration, inscriptions, etc. It contains not a little rare, and not a little new information, admirably adapted to throw light on the sacred book. Dr. Delitzsch is too well known through his "Biblical Psychology," "Commentary on Genesis," and other works, to need special characterization. His standpoint is that of repristinated Lutheranism, though he is more independent of the stiff scholastic form of the elder Lutheran orthodoxy than some of the party with which he is associated. The authorship of the book of Job he attributes to one of the sages who surrounded the court of Solomon, making his era, in the words of Professor Barnewell, "brighter than the Elizabethan and nobler than the Augustan." On this point he has the support of such authorities as Hävernick, Vaihinger, Hahn, Schlottmann, Oehler, Keil, and Hoffmann, the last of whom has changed his mind since publishing his work entitled "Prophecy and Fulfillment." In that he advocated the theory of its composition in the Mosaic age. The statement of the problem of the book, and of the answer given thereto, is admirable. Among other erroneous fancies, that some time ago started by *Renan*, (1859,) that the object of the poem was to refute and do away with the old Mosaic doctrine of temporal retribution, is emphatically repudiated. Dr. Delitzsch shows that what M. Renan understands to be the old Mosaic doctrine of retribution (that

is, as perfectly administered in this life, so that all suffering presupposes guilt) was no part either of patriarchal or of Mosaic theology. The text is reproduced in a new translation, the historical parts in prose, the body of the book in poetic strophes. His version and explanation of the famous utterance of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc., differs but slightly from that given by Dr. Tayler Lewis in these pages, July, 1863. Some crudities and groundless fancies have found their way into the book, but as a whole it is an admirable production, useful alike to the practical preacher and professional theologian.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-book of Facts in Science and Art for 1864. Exhibiting the most Important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Edited by DAVID A. WELLS, A.M., M.D. 12mo., pp. 351. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1864.

Mr. Wells, the faithful chronicler of the progress of Science, makes a very welcome annual visit to our table. This year, as last, he reports largely of improvements in the science of human destruction. There seems to be little advance in the search for the "fossil man." Neither the doctrine of Darwinian development or of the pre-adamite man has received any such demonstration as to remove it from the category of mere opinion to that of accomplished science.

We give a few items from this volume.

The following paragraph dissipates a favorite idea in regard to bee instinct:

In the *Annals of Natural History*, (London,) 1863, will be found an analysis of the mathematics of the bee-hive, by Rev. S. Houghton, in which the theory of the bee's forming hexagonal cells is completely overthrown. Lord Brougham, in his treatise *Dialogues on Instinct*, remarks: "There is no bee in the world that ever made cylindrical cells;" and the fact of the existence of hexagonal cells in the honeycomb is generally quoted as a wonderful example of instinctive combination of means to ends in a low form of animal existence. Mr. Houghton, however, shows that the bee makes only cylindrical cells, and that the hexagonal and rhomboidal cells are alike the result of pressure, and represent the angles of equilibrium between the pressure and the resistance, just as the orbits of the planets are the midway lines between centrifugal and centripetal forces; the bee is not, therefore, such a mathematician as has been generally supposed. The alleged economy of material resulting from the bee's method of working is also shown to be fallacious. Several mathematicians have carefully investigated the relation of expenditure of material to the mathematical requirements of connected cells of given dimensions and of a form adapted to the uses to which they are to be put. L'Huilier, in 1781, arrived at the conclusion that the economy of wax referred to the total expenditure is $\frac{1}{31}$st, so that the bees can make fifty-one cells instead of fifty by the adoption of the rhombic dodecahedron. He also showed that mathematicians can make cells of the same form as those of the bees, which, instead of using only a *minimum* of wax, would use the *minimum minimorum*, so that five cells could

be made of less wax than that which now makes only four, instead of fifty-one out of fifty. The humble-bee, moreover, in the construction of its cells, uses proportionably more than three times the amount of material that is used by the hive-bee.—P. 158.

The so-called Spiritual Phenomena.—A recognition of the *reality of many* of the phenomena—physical or physiological—which are popularly classified under the term "*Spiritual*" appears to be gradually gaining ground among the scientific men of the United States and Europe. Among the names of note *who are reported* during the past year as having extended such a recognition we find that of Professor De Morgan, who is confessedly one of the most distinguished of living British physicists and mathematicians.—P. xi.

One striking fact in the perusal of this and every other scientific book at the present day is the number of new *words* coined by the "physicists" and "scientists" generally to suit their purpose. Whole vocabularies spring up every season. Common sense both justifies and requires this; and we think our men of science are right in treating with quiet silence the pedantic purist who should exclaim, "That is a barbarism; it is not in Webster's Dictionary!" The simple question is, is it a precise, self-defining term for an object or thought which has no existing name in the language? If not, then it is an abortion and a nuisance, and should be abated. If it be, it is, like every other needed invention, a benefit to the world.

At page 285 a writer thus argues against the doctrine of man's creation: "When a mammal was created, did the oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon of the air, and the lime, soda, phosphorus, potash, water, etc., from the earth, come together, and on the instant combine into a completely formed horse, lion, elephant, or other animal? If this question is answered in the affirmative, it will be easily seen that the answer is entirely opposed by the observed analogies of nature." We should answer that science has nothing whatever to say about a creation, and so nothing against it. Science was not upon the spot to observe how it was done; nor was she upon the spot to say how it was not done. If done by a known and experienced supernatural intervention she cannot know it, for she limits herself to the level of secondary causes and cannot look upward or Godward. But other and higher knowledges are not bound to limit themselves to this low ground. We presume that our reader who has not thought upon the subject will indeed feel a difficulty in picturing, or imagining to himself these various elements of a man concentrating into a human body. But that same reader would find it equally difficult to conceive the following process of actual nature, quoted by Mr. Wells from the *Westminster Review*:

The student of nature wonders the more, and is astonished the less, the more conversant he becomes with her operations; but of all the perennial miracles she offers to his inspection, perhaps the most worthy of admiration is the development of a plant or an animal from its embryo. Examine the recently laid egg of some

animal, such as a salamander or a newt. It is a minute spheroid in which the best microscope will reveal nothing but a structureless sac, inclosing a glairy fluid, holding granules in suspension. But strange possibilities lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle, and the plastic matter undergoes changes so steady and purpose-like in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skillful modeler upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel, the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And, then, it is as if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body; pinching up the head at one end, the tail at the other, and fashioning flank and limb into due salamandrine proportions, in so artistic a way that, after watching the process hour by hour, one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtile aid to vision than an achromatic glass would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skillful manipulation to perfect his work.

As life advances, and the young amphibian ranges the waters, the terror of his insect cotemporaries, not only are nutritious particles supplied by its prey, by the addition of which to its frame growth takes place, laid down, each in its proper spot, and in such due proportion to the rest, as to reproduce the form, the color, and the size characteristic of the parental stock; but even the wonderful powers of reproducing lost parts possessed by these animals are controlled by the same governing tendency. Cut off the legs, the tail, the jaws—separately or all together—and, as Spallanzan showed long ago, these parts not only grow again, but the redintegrated limb is formed on the same type as those which were lost. The new jaw or leg is a newt's, and never by any accident more like that of a frog.—P. 258.

Jehovah-God we are told in the Record made *man in his own image*. Repeatedly are we told also that Jehovah appeared to patriarchs and other ancients *in a human form*. Did that same Jehovah at the first assume that form, and then bid the protoplast take shape and appear like a mirrored image before him and in his own likeness?

As pertinent to this objector's difficulty, we take the following remarks from the Third Article in the last *London Review*:

What right, again, have we to lay it down as certain that such and such results must have taken so long to bring about? *If you intensify the force*, the simplest formula in mechanics will tell you that you may diminish the time. We never could see why, because results are slowly produced now, they must always have gone on at the same rate. But all this is beside the grand question which we are led to believe underlies all this talk about development and mutability of species; the question is, "Is man a higher development of the anthropoid ape?" On this point it is enough to say that, whatever may be proved by and by as to transmutation of species, whatever structural affinity between man and certain quadrumana may have been or may hereafter be established, nothing of this kind touches the question. Man is man not so much by virtue of his structure as because of his distinct *functions*: his throat may be anatomically all but the same as that of the ourang, but *he can speak with his throat*; he alone has "the breath of life whereby he is a living soul."—P. 63.

We had marked a number of passages in Mr. Wells's Annual which limited space forbids us to use.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Specimen Pages of the American Conflict: A History of the Great Rebellion in the United States of America, 1860–1864; Its Causes, Incidents, and Results. Intended to exhibit especially its Moral and Political

Phases with the Drift and Progress of American Opinion respecting Human Slavery from 1776 to 1864. By HORACE GREELEY. Illustrated by Portraits on steel of Generals, Statesmen, and other Eminent Men; Views of Important Places, Battle Scenes, and Diagrams from Official Sources, etc. Hartford: O. D. Case & Co. Chicago: George Sherwood & Co. 1864.

The title-page is so full and descriptive as to be a book notice in itself. Mr. Greeley undertakes to be the historian of the second and greater American Revolution through which we are now so anxiously passing. No man living is perhaps more competent for the task. Few cotemporaries have so clearly comprehended the significance of its events at every stage. True final history is indeed made up of great after thought; but it is the cotemporary who furnishes the material; and, perhaps, there is no man among us whose opinions and statements are more the type of what after history will say.

He did not enter early into the antislavery battle. And we speak here all the more boldly because Mr. Greeley's preliminary review both of the influence of early Christianity upon slavery and of the position of the Christian Church at the present day is eminently defective. New England Methodism had discussed and had become nearly unanimous before he had, even in his public action, touched the topic. The Methodist Church had been severed by the question before Mr. Greeley woke to its existence. It is true that such was the influence of Mr. Greeley's associates, the old Whig party of our Atlantic cities, and especially of our metropolitan New York, that even after we had let the southern section go, we were ruled and hamstrung by border pro-slaveryism. From that same influence exerted ever since over his daily organ by our conservative laity even in the Republican ranks, (a large share of our religious conservatives were political Republicans,) the antislavery ministry of our Church have fought the battle in our Church with no aid or sympathy from the *New York Tribune*.

But since the time that Mr. Greeley entered the contest in which he was so long preceded by whole sections of Methodism, he has evinced the courage, tirelessness, and sagacity of a great leader. And with the exception of its religious phases—for doing justice to which he has not the heart and therefore no other qualification—the same sagacity which rendered him so generally master of the field of discussion, renders him a master of its history. And those high humanitarian views which he has taken of all the secular parts of the subject will be the views that posterity will take, and the verdict of mankind will forever affirm.

We need not say that the work will be written in that clear, full, earnest, powerful style of vernacular English and natural common

sense in which Mr. Greeley so excels, in which William Cobbett was his type, but not his equal. The "Specimens" are done in a handsome style of typographic art, on a clean ground of snow-white paper, with engravings, not indeed masterpieces of art, but which, in this day of scragged caricatures, are, on the whole, acceptable likenesses. We herein expect a history well worth general acceptance, accurate in its details of fact, authoritative in its expressions of opinion, a standard both for present reference and for future historical writers.

A Youth's History of the Rebellion, from the Bombardment of Fort Sumter to the Capture of Roanoke Island. By WILLIAM M. THAYER. 24mo., pp. 347. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co.

The history of the rebellion is here given in free colloquial style, under guise of family conversation. Care has been duly taken of historical accuracy, and the spirit of freedom and patriotism inspires the narrative. Such books should supplant the fictions with which our youths are so much drugged.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

The Social Condition of the People of England. By JOSEPH KAY, Esq., M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge. 12mo., pp. 323. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

England is now in the grasp of a landholding oligarchy, just as a slaveholding oligarchy has brought us to the brink of ruin. Probably about three thousand families control the English government. A few thousand landlords hold the soil. Five men, it is said, own one fourth of all Scotland. This terrible monopoly is increasing rather than diminishing in absoluteness.

The result is that the small freeholder is an extinct species, and the landless lack room. Earth and space are too costly for the dowerless occupant. Families are crowded in the least possible limits, and a contact of persons ensues which banishes shame, and often reduces the whole to a sweltering mass of debauchery and brutalism. Thirty pages of Mr. Kay's book unfolding this state of things are absolutely but necessarily too indecent to be read aloud, or to be copied into our pages. When it is understood that so degraded have entire counties and sections of England become that it violates no current sense of propriety for a father to swear, in open court, that he *witnessed* the debauchery by which his daughter became the mother of a bastard, we must realize that modern Protestant England must forestall revolution by reform or revolution will be more desirable than the ruin that must ensue. Neither God nor man can endure the nuisance of such a Sodom on earth.

The advocates of slavery in this country used to point to the

terrible condition of the English poor as a reason why antislavery England should be silent in regard to the great American crime. It was a pitiful attempt at retort. It is not antislavery England, but pro-slavery England, the England that pets the slaveholders' rebellion, and lets loose Alabamas upon the commerce of our free states, that supports this system. It is not philanthropic England, but the pro-slavery and pirate England, upon which rests the guilt. And pirate England never sincerely rebuked slavery. The true rebukers of slavery in England are the rebukers also of this crushing landlordism. The common friends of humanity in both countries are one, condemning wrong, oppression, demoralization, in every form and in every land. Nor must it be forgotten that this demoralization has not been the aim and object of a direct legislation. The English statute books are not blackened with any laws like the American slave code, forbidding instruction and purposely aiming at brutalizing her English poor. This degradation is the indirect and undesired result of a system selfish indeed, but not, like our slave system, intentionally diabolical.

Our laws of inheritance, dividing estates, and our extensive domains, counteract the tendencies to great land monopoly. Did Europe pour no hordes of pauperism into our country we should, beyond all doubt, be the purest population that history has yet revealed. Our mobs are foreign. Europe, and especially England, pours upon us the mob material and then reproaches us for being mobocratic. What we do is to accept her wretched population, raise them to citizenship, educate them into humanity, and during the process bear the reproaches which the oppressors, who have made them mob, so magnanimously heap upon us for their mobishness. The English papers talk scornfully of "the New York mob;" but that "New York mob" is a British mob. Give us time, that is, a generation or two, to Americanize, that is, to educate and assimilate it, and it will be a healthful, noble part of our social system. When it ceases to be British it ceases to be mob. We gave the world the temperance reform because we had the European mob to elevate. Had we none but our own home-born Protestant, free school, and evangelical Church population, we should either have needed no temperance reform, or the temperance reform would have been a perfect success.

Mr. Kay's book is both a reproach and an honor to England. A reproach for the state of things it exposes, an honor for the spirit and the men who expose and aim to reform it. May they succeed in their godlike work, and render England a thousand times purer, greater, and more prosperous than she is!

The stupendous neglect of the education of the masses by the English Church has allowed them to sink below all sympathy with her church forms and services. "A Romanist service, or a Ranter's service, will attract crowds of poor, where the service of the English Church, or of the Independents, or of the Methodists, or of the Baptists will not attract fifty. But it will be said that the Presbyterian churches of Scotland are filled, although the service is even less imaginative than that of the English Church. It is so because the Scotch poor are much better educated, and much more intelligent than our poor; because the Presbyterian clergymen are not nearly so far separated from the poor in their social origin, habits, and education as our clergy, and because they visit their people in their cottages very much more than our English clergy can do." There is, too, a loss of all sympathy between the masses and clergy arising from the uniformly over-refinement of the clerical character. The church clergyman is a university-bred gentleman, and the effluvium in the filthy tenements of the poor is repulsive to his senses.

It is a common remark of the operatives of Lancashire, and one which is only too true, "Your Church is a Church for the rich, but not for the poor. It was not intended for such people as we are."

The Roman Church is much wiser than the English in this respect. It selects a great part of its priests from the poorest classes of society, and educates them gratuitously in great simplicity of habits. The consequence is, that they feel no difficulty in mingling with the poor. Many of them are not men of refined habits themselves, and are not therefore disgusted at want of refinement in others. They understand perfectly what are the thoughts, feelings, and habits of the poor. They know how to suit their demeanor, conversation, teaching, and actions so as to make the poor quite at ease with them. They do not feel the disgust which a more refined man cannot help feeling, in being obliged to enter the low haunts of the back streets and alleys.

It is singular to observe how the priests of Romanist countries abroad associate with the poor. I have often seen them riding with the peasants in their carts along the roads, eating with them in their houses, sitting with them in the village inns, mingling with them in their village festivals, and yet always preserving their authority. Besides this, the spectacles of the Romanist worship are more attractive to the less educated masses than the less imaginative forms of Protestant worship, and the services of the Roman Church are shorter and much more numerous than those of the English. These causes fill the Romanist churches, both abroad and in our manufacturing districts, on the Sundays, and at the early matins of the weekdays, with crowds of poor, who go there to receive the blessing of their priests, to hear prayers put up, which they believe to be for blessings, although they do not understand them, and to see the glittering spectacles of the Romanist worship exhibited before them.

There are significant facts before us if we would but see them. Within the last few years splendid Romanist Churches, full of free sittings, have been springing up in all the crowded districts of England, and especially in the manufacturing towns of the north. In Manchester alone, three beautiful Romanist churches, and one magnificent Romanist Cathedral—now by far the finest building in the town—have been erected within the last twelve years. The priests seem to be able to obtain as much money as they require, and to spare no pains to attract the people. Their exertions among the poorest of the operatives, and in the lowest of their haunts, are praiseworthy in the extreme. They know that it is infinitely more important to have priests than churches. When they build a

church, therefore, they generally attach to it, not one, but several, and often many priests, some of them chosen from the lowest classes of the community, and educated expressly for their labors. In the manufacturing districts of England, a large handsome building, of the same style of architecture as the church, and capable of serving as the dwelling house of ten or twelve priests, is generally attached to each of the churches.—P. 69.

Here are some very important considerations for us as American Methodists. We need the rich and the refined and the learned, but not at the price of abandoning the poor and the uneducated. We want a ministry equal to the best in the Universal Church in erudition and pulpit talent and intellect; and we want a ministry that can go into the hamlet, hut, and the lowest cellar without overawing its tenants with its respectability. How can these two be obtained and continued? How can each class and each man be induced to move contentedly, spontaneously, and eagerly in his own sphere, unimpeded by jealousy against *caste?* Romanism can do it. Why not Methodism?

Speeches, Lectures, and Letters. By WENDELL PHILLIPS. 12mo., pp. 562. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1864.

Mr. Phillips's speeches might, for several reasons, well be entitled *Philippics.* The original Philippic was indeed so titled from its object; these as well from their author. But from their subject and substance no ancient oratory was ever more brilliant with keen sarcasm, splendid invective, or destructive satire, scattered like diamond handfuls in every direction. Walker & Wise have here enshrined them in a classic exterior; rightly, for they are classic, as products of rare genius, aristocratic culture, stern moral purpose, historic permanence.

Mr. Phillips's "first appearance on the stage" was unintentionally somewhat scenic. The murder of Lovejoy had just startled the public mind. The gun of Sumter did not more unequivocally inaugurate the rebellion than the gun of Alton proclaimed the enthronization of the slave-king over the entire North amid enforced silence and abolished freedom. The words of James T. Austin, comparing this deed of mob despotism to the Boston tea-party of the Revolution, aroused the spirit of young Wendell Phillips, and called a mightier Lovejoy to the battle of truth and freedom. Very appropriately, that first impulsive utterance stands as first in this collection. It was a noble introductory to a series of the most manly utterances of the age.

We had read many of Mr. Phillips's speeches before we had heard one. The fiery style of the printed text seemed, upon listening to his voice, in unexpected contrast with the deliberate coolness of his manner. The lava poured forth without seeming at all to heat the

machinery that poured it. It seemed to be carefully measured out in well-calculated bucketsful. There seems to be a very calm, intellectual, aristocratic Phillips behind the fierce, fiery, radical Phillips; and the back Phillips seems to have made up his mind that it mattered little what the front Phillips had to meet, whether hisses, obsolete eggs, or democratic rows; he—the back Phillips—was securely undisturbed and no way implicated in the concern. This indicates the naturally endowed agitator. He purposes and prepares his whole system of pyrotechnics upon principle. Was he not a man of high moral principle, had he not taken right and truth and perfection as his ultimate aim, he could in turbulent times be "lord of misrule."

Though Mr. Phillips deals master truths at the delinquent part of the Church and clergy, we find no proof of his working in behalf of irreligion. He makes not antislaveryism a vantage ground against orthodoxy. He shows none of the rancorous polemic mendacity of Theodore Parker. Here as elsewhere his castigations are well measured and truthfully adjusted. His anger, if his polished invectives really ever indicate anything designated by that term, is sequent upon offense against his righteous cause; never is the righteous cause made the pretext of subsidiary purposes. We believe that he sees men at the present day very much as they will stand in the light of future history.

His lecture on Toussaint L'Overture—the jet black hero and statesman of St. Domingo—shows that he deals not in invective because he is not as perfect a master of eulogy. That piece should be read as an illustration in what audacity of lying pro-slaveryism has indulged, what persistence in refusing to hear truth servility has practiced. "The massacre of St. Domingo!" has been a phrase of mystery suggesting the unknown horrors, forsooth, in which emancipation must ever result! Yet the truth of history, when clearly made known, shows the bloody treachery of despotism, the magnanimity of the slave, and the unsurpassed greatness of one illustrious negro.

We commend this book to the perusal of all, but especially of our young men. It is throughout a noble lesson. We admire not the character of the professional agitator. Ultraisms and radicalism in themselves are inconveniences and so evils. The presumption is rightly and truly against them. But they are not necessarily moral evils, and they may be by greater evils transformed to good. The true highest test is Right; the secondary test is an ultimate Good. In this sordid age nothing is more important than that men should learn to separate the element of justice and the true good from those conventional interests that blind and pervert the eye of the soul.

Miscellaneous.

A Treatise on Homiletics: Designed to Illustrate the Theory and Practice of Preaching the Gospel. By DANIEL P. KIDDER, D.D., Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute. 12mo., pp. 494. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

This work of Dr. Kidder's is by far the best manual for the young minister that we have examined, and is specially adapted for the ministry of our own Church. Of the entire literature of the subject he shows himself eminently a master; he has adduced from every source an immense variety of suggestions, enriched by his own additions, modified by a wise common sense, and expressed in a perfectly lucid style. We trust it will be studied by our junior ministry in general, and that it will take its place in our course of text-books. More we should add, but we expect the work to be the subject of an article in our Quarterly.

The National Almanac and Annual Record for the Year 1864. 12mo., pp. 641. Philadelphia: George W. Childs.

Mr. Childs's National Almanac is a masterpiece of condensation. Of the United States, it furnishes the details of persons and matters in the various departments of State, War, Navy, and Treasury. Of the individual states, the details political, judicial, financial, military, and literary. Statistics are furnished of the religious denominations of the world. A chronological record is made of the events of the year. The hundred concluding pages are devoted to a compressed summary of the affairs of foreign nations. The work is unsurpassed as a standard of reference.

Pamphlets.

The Compendium of Tachygraphy; or, Lindsley's Phonetic Short-hand, Explaining and Illustrating the Common Style of the Art. By D. P. LINDSLEY, Teacher of Phonetic Short-hand in Bryant, Stratton, & Co.'s Commercial College, Hartford, Conn. 12mo., pp. 32. Hartford, Conn.: Brown & Gross. 1864.

This is an exhibit of a new short-hand, intended to supplant Pitman's Phonography, which the author considers a failure. In what respect it is any less defective or any more perfect we are unable to see. Its main difference in principle consists in bringing the vowels into the body of the word, instead of leaving them as supplementary and optional points. This seems to us the reverse of an improvement. In all our use of phonography we have considered it a great advantage that we could write consonants alone in the first draught and then supply vowels as we read what we had written. And by a competent supplement of vowels we can render it as unequivocal as chirography can be. This supplied a limitation decisive in itself with-

out obliging a perpetual indecision and choice whether or not to insert the vowel while writing the body of the word.

We see not the slightest ground for the assumption that phonography is a failure. We have found no difficulty in corresponding with our phonographic brethren; and were our correspondents, compositors, proof-readers, and friends all phonographers, we should use nothing else. And indeed were every phonographer thus enabled to use phonography always and alone in all his writing, it would in all cases be successful. All the difficulties encounter Mr. Lindsley's system that encounter Pitman's. If phonography cannot succeed, no other system of short-hand can; for both in theory and in practice we esteem it geometrically an ultimate. We therefore feel it a duty to express a friendly regret that any attempt like Mr. Lindsley's should be made, and our advice that nobody imagine it to be comparable to Pitman's.

Lay Representation in the Methodist Episcopal Church: its Justice and Expediency. By GILBERT HAVEN. 12mo., pp. 46. Boston: J. P. Magee. 1864.

Mr. Haven's pamphlet is a spicy and vigorous production. In the matter of "justice," it maintains the *right* of the laity to a share in religious and ecclesiastical administration from both the Old Testament and the New. The argument is, to say the least, quite as good as the scripture proof by the venerable fathers, Bond, Bangs, and Barnes, excluding the laity from all such right. Few of us at the present day doubt that *right*. And yet we are gratified to see that in face of the fact that our ministry sacrifice so many rights, our lay brethren have not latterly argued the matter on the ground of *rights*, but of "*the best good of the Church.*" We doubt not they are great gainers by this method of putting the case. We recommend the pamphlet before us to the attention of both ministry and laity.

The action of the late General Conference on the subject meets, we believe, the hearty concurrence of all concerned. Its own further action was estopped by the late vote; but the subject is now placed by its direct authority before our attention as a matter of Church-wide consideration and discussion. The columns of our church papers will doubtless be opened to a free and generous debate. So also are the pages of our Quarterly.

The following books arrived too late for notice in the present number: Spring's Pulpit Ministrations, 2 vols., 8vo., Harpers. Merivale's Roman History, Vol. IV, Appleton & Co. Hazard on the Will, Appleton & Co. Harpers' Pictorial History of the Great Rebellion, No. 7. Bethune's Lectures on the Catechism, Sheldon & Co. Light in Darkness, Gould & Lincoln. The Memorial Hour, Gould & Lincoln. Dr. Wayland's Memoir of Chalmers, Gould & Lincoln. Letters of Mendelssohn, from Leypoldt, Phil.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1864.

Art. I.—MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

It is a thought lying at the very core of Christian responsibility, that it is not so much man's *effort* which God uses as his instrument to bring men to himself, as *man himself*. Not human arguments and appeals, conflicts and struggles, treasure and tears, so much as human character; not the man's tools or weapons, but the concrete being, himself reflecting God's glory, gushing with divine sympathy, fervent with divine zeal; man the "embassador of God," intrusted with the responsibility of maintaining the divine honor, bringing his credentials in his look, his tones, his gestures; he it is that is to negotiate with rebellious men in the Great King's behalf, and knit their hearts to his.

It is not, then, the Christian minister's sermons, or visits, or charities, not his logic or his eloquence, his plans or his sacrifices; but it is the *man* that is the weapon in God's hand. And this weapon should be tempered and sharpened by the highest human skill. Nowhere else does the world need so much the highest style of man. In no other business of life can the largest, most liberal culture be so thoroughly employed without crossing the legitimate boundaries of the profession. When the lawyer has finished his argument, his work is done; the scholar elaborates his speculations and throws them upon the world, and they live or die according as they have in them the vitality of truth; what is called political success is cheaply

obtained by narrow culture and shrewd catering to the passions of men, and if the aspirant for these honors but performs his part well in public, the masses of men ask not, care not, where he is when not on the stage before them; but the Christian minister is always in the harness—whether in official garb or in dressing robe and slippers, will or nill, he is always at work in his profession. For there it is the *man*, and not the man's hand, or tongue, or brain that works. The man behind the words and works, behind the play of the features or the flash of the eye, the man in the strength and symmetry of his character, in the depth of his convictions, the fervor of his sympathies, the gush of his emotions, the man everywhere, if he be a real Christian minister, is a steady battery ever pouring its fire upon human sin. For the orator to persuade, he must seem sincere while on the rostrum, or all his tones and tears are wasted; but the artificial sincerity, the oratorical illusion of the hour will answer his purpose, for his ordeal ends when he steps down from the rostrum; but the preacher's ordeal never ceases, and it is fiercest at the fireside and the bedside. To have a true Christian minister's success, he must not seem to be standing before men to make a plea for an hour or for an emergency, but to unbar the gates of his inmost being, and let the sparks of truth fly from a heart where all men may see that that flame burns evermore. To achieve the highest success he should be an orator, with all the graces of speech and tone and gesture; but he must be far more than an orator, or he fails as a Christian minister. He may succeed as an orator, and win an orator's fame, as has many a preacher Catholic and Protestant, but he must be content to receive an orator's reward; he will never hear his master say "well done." He should be a scholar, skilled to defend his theses with all the weapons of logic, keen to detect analogies and confirmations of religious truth in all the manifold fields of human research, able to follow through all the mental and material universe within our reach the subtle thread that fastens truth to truth and binds all to the Throne; all this he should be and must be to achieve the highest success, yet all this he may be and not feel one throb of the Christian minister's triumph. The *man* is more than the scholar, more than the orator, more than the reasoner; and it is the thoroughly trained, harmoniously

developed *man*, that is to do this work with the highest success, the work of representing Christ to men.

Our fathers were compelled, by the vastness and richness of the waving fields, to send many an inexperienced laborer to thrust in his sickle, yet they earnestly inculcated diligent and thorough culture of all the powers, that the man might be steadily strengthened and hardened for his work. Where are there written more earnest and thorough admonitions to diligent and painstaking culture, spiritual and intellectual, than in John Wesley's rules for his preachers? The Christian minister's first duty is with himself. "Study," says Paul to Timothy, "to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." The duties physical and spiritual which the preacher owes to himself we here pass by to discuss mainly the duties intellectual.

The Christian minister's whole duty is to persuade men to become Christians; if he come short of this he fails, no matter what other splendid things he may do; if he achieve this he succeeds, no matter in what other things he fails. "Go ye, and disciple (*μαθητεύσατε*) all nations;" these are the words of the commission. To persuade others to be Christians, the first grand qualification is for the man to be a Christian himself; but it is desirable that the precious germ of spiritual life should be fructified in a generous soil, in order that it may live and flourish amid the withering blights and killing frosts which are sure to fall upon it in the Christian ministry. His duties in the public assembly and in the home, by the cradle, the altar, and the grave, are constantly bringing him where he lays his hand on the heart when it is most tender; he is freely invited to enter the very holy of holies of the human affections, while men of all other professions are bid to stand afar off; and again, the truths which, falling from heaven, are reflected from him among men, glorify him in their eyes, as the opaque mirror dazzles the eye while it reflects the sun, so that it comes to pass, that from the very nature of his professional duties, he is exposed to the temptations of vanity and self-sufficiency above all other men, while yet to yield to such temptations for a moment, whatever other success it may offer, is sure to destroy his success as a Christian minister. For the very idea of the office is forgetfulness of self in absorbing devotion to the mas-

ter; "we are embassadors of God," and when the embassador is detected in negotiating for himself, that moment his mission fails. Thus the preacher, who from the very nature of his office can succeed only by self-forgetfulness, is incessantly tempted to self-sufficiency, yea, and with success the temptation increases.

Now I do not mean to intimate that mental culture, even when broadest and most generous, is an effectual safeguard against this self-sufficiency, but only that the lack of it furnishes extraordinary facilities for the temptation. This is the very temptation by which an ill-poised, superficially cultivated mind is most easily overthrown. The Christian minister should be holy enough to see how unclean is the purest human heart before Him, if he would escape the meshes of spiritual vanity; and to be clear from the temptations of self-sufficiency on the intellectual side, it is desirable to know enough to see what childish prattle is the highest human wisdom, to be strong enough to know that the highest human strength is a bruised reed.

As we treat of the culture that is desirable, we point to the Ideal at which we should aim; and a correct Ideal held steadily in view will secure a far higher practical realization than one that is low and imperfect. Our Church has hardly begun to realize its own Ideal; unable to get what we would, we have gratefully taken what we could. "A little learning is a dangerous thing," says the poet; but it is certainly far less dangerous than no learning at all.

We take it for granted that the preacher will study theology in all its departments, doctrines, and history, in whatever books he can find it. But what we are accustomed to call theological study, however thorough and systematic, is no adequate preparation for the Christian ministry. Active life, in any employment or profession, generally developes but one set of muscles, physical or intellectual. We look in vain through all the ranks of mere professional men for the harmoniously developed character, the "*homo teres atque rotundus.*" The real man exists only in fragments, scattered all abroad, and we must make the tour of a score of professions and employments to find the materials of which to form him. It would require the choice limbs and faculties of a hundred to furnish the

materials for the ideal man. Let the smith furnish an arm, the surgeon a hand, a blind man touch; let the painter furnish an eye, the musician an ear, the farmer a digestive apparatus, and a charcoal dealer wind; let a knot of artists make up the taste; let a lawyer find shrewdness, a politician cunning, a judge discrimination, a general will, and so on; select the limb or faculty that each man's work develops, and you may combine them all into the ideal man.

Now as no human occupation taxes all the faculties equally, one-sided development is unavoidable to a greater or less degree; but as in our profession, as we have seen, it is the whole man that does the work, this one-sided development militates especially against our usefulness, and any effort or device that can diminish or modify it makes us more efficient and promotes the salvation of men. Generally speaking, an officer of the Church militant is easily distinguishable by his uniform; not that which the tailor furnishes, but that which is manufactured upon him by his daily duties, a uniform of look, language, tone, carriage, gesture. No other profession is so easily detected in a crowd as that of the clergyman. And this is because so many of the profession use but one set of muscles.

Add to this that popular opinion allows the clergyman fewer recreations than any other man. Even in his amusements, the man cannot, if he will, slip out of the minister. Hence there is danger that the energies will be prematurely exhausted by the continuous tension of one set of muscles, and by chafing against the hard professional walls between which the man's whole activity is circumscribed. The ministerial profession is to many a poor body the shirt of Nessus: it strips the flesh from the bones. Now in intellectual toils, not absolute repose but change is the true recreation. And to avoid this one-sidedness, to secure this recreation, man must have a taste, a love for other fields of thought than those which lie between the strict professional limits. Let the minister of Christ cultivate this taste and he will live longer, work harder, retain physical and mental vigor to a later period in life, save more souls, glorify God more fully in body and spirit.

But this general culture is to be sought not only to make the Christian minister a thoroughly developed man, not only to furnish him recreation, but to furnish him arguments, facts,

illustrations, suggestions, which are the very tools and materials on which he may lay his hand in the ordinary routine of ministerial duty. There is no field of literature or science out of which a live and earnest mind will not dig facts, which it will forge into weapons for the warfare with sin. All the sciences of earth are stratified upon the granite of theology; through whatever stratum of human thinking we dig we come down to theology at last, and this in turn is upheaved through all, so that on whatever stratum we stand, we look far up to those cloud-wreathed, sun-lit heights. Now the man who has dug down to this formation in a hundred different places has a hundred-fold the idea of its extent and massiveness that the man has who has all his life been toiling in one dimly-lighted shaft. A man who has beheld these awful heights of religious truth from a hundred different points of view (natural faculties and spiritual discernment being supposed equal) has a hundred different aspects of the glorious view to present, when the traveler who has seen them only from the worn highway has but one. There is no domain of human thought from which these granite summits are not visible, none from which a new and refreshing view may not be gained. We see them from the most dusky coverts of long-forgotten lore, from the densest thickets of metaphysic thought, from all the groves and gardens and porticoes of philosophy, and from the loftiest summits of speculation and imagination we behold them still, far above, blending with the eternal heavens.

Extraordinaries excepted, the foundation of this general culture must be laid before life's proper work begins; at least the taste for it must then be formed if formed at all. After entering on the real work of the Christian ministry there is little time or vigor for voyaging away to discover new continents of fact or fancy; but if the man has discovered beforehand where they lie, he may spread his sail for them in any leisure hour; yea, he may gaze out toward them, and drink in relief even in moments of lassitude, as the tired artisan looks forth from his window at the distant hills and sunset clouds. We should survey many realms of thought of which we never take possession. Though we may bring away only a single cluster and leave a whole Eshcol vintage in the valley ungathered, we have at

least seen and tasted of the fatness of the land. We should glance down the great highways that run through all the realms of human thinking, and tread a few steps in them, if we can do no more, that we may know the way, if duty or desire ever lead us to travel there. A few steps only will give us a glance at the landscape, a smell of the fragrance, a taste of the fruit, and a consciousness of the eternally opening vista; and if we learn no more, we shall at least be saved from professional narrowness, by learning that from where we stand at any moment, these highways radiate through infinity.

When we have reached the dusty road of active manhood, especially if it be manhood in the Christian ministry, we have no leisure for the acquisition of the rudiments of languages and sciences; we must then work with such tools as we have, though if we have made our tools, and the hand has become accustomed to them, it is easy to sharpen them in leisure hours. Of course this remark applies to average men; there are illustrious exceptions confirming the rule, which are familiar names through all our Church. Christian humility would of course suggest that the candidate for holy orders should not imagine himself exceedingly above average men. Where one man has succeeded in following at a great distance in the footsteps of such giants as Bishop Hedding and Adam Clarke, a thousand have failed. No man has a right to imagine himself such a miracle of industry and endurance. As the average human mind is constituted there must be years of quiet undistracted study and thought to give opportunity to digest and assimilate this intellectual food. And, moreover, the general culture is more important to the preacher than the strictly theological; the latter will certainly be obtained in active life, if the other is laid down as its foundation; but the general culture is ordinarily made sure of in early life or never; and to provide for a man mere professional culture is like furnishing him with a weapon without a handle.

Let us glance at the field. Three great realms of thought and investigation invite us, Nature, Men, and Books. These three departments of study overlap and intermingle somewhat; for example, other men lend us their eyes, and feet, and hands, to use in our preliminary rambles into Nature, till we learn enough to leave our guides and go out alone. So the best

things in a man are often crystallized into his book; and still again, fresh contact with Nature alone can teach us what thousands of words mean.

Many preachers think of the study of Nature only as connected with Natural Theology, technically so called. But natural theology is a system of human deductions and speculations, which are modified, revised, supplemented and annulled with the varying stages of human progress. We do not here call attention to Nature's bones, when picked and wired together by the natural theologian, profitable though this dissection and anatomy may be; but to nature herself, older, yet younger than all human theologies. The stars themselves, as you look steadily into their glowing eyes, flash to your soul lessons of wisdom too deep for any Butler or Chalmers to interpret, and coin into human speech—the squirrels will chatter to you from the tree-top, the sparrows will chirrup to you from the door-stone, truths which no Bridgewater treatise could ever build into the towers of Zion.

Botanists, zoologists, artists, may point out to us the trodden paths where traveling is easy, but we must climb where there is no path, and swim where there is no bridge, to see nature's freshest bloom and hear her heartiest welcome. These guides must not be allowed to intrude themselves officiously upon us; let them know their place and keep their distance. The cicerone is very needful and welcome to us, but the time comes when his voice is distracting cackle in our ears. Nature is a coy damsel, and must be wooed alone.

As already intimated, nature alone can give us the meaning of multitudes of common words, words that once leaped from her bosom, but have been long stifled in books. They must be carried back where they can catch the glow of her heart again, that they may leap from our lips alive. What dictionaries or encyclopedias can define the word "sea" to the man who has never been splashed by the seething spray, or dandled on that green heaving lap between heaven and earth? What does the word "forest" mean to the man who has never trodden the leafy solitude, where the ear aches with the silence, and the moss-bearded monarchs look down compassionately on the insignificant intruder as he wanders bewildered in their endless halls? What does the word "mountain" mean to

him who never toiled up the slippery peak, while clouds in an avalanche submerged the world beneath, and left him clinging to an island in the midst of the heavens? These words pass current everywhere: bank-notes which all men use, but for which millions never draw the bullion, that is, they never present them to nature for redemption. But nature has piled in her vaults the golden bars which can redeem them all a million fold: no fears of bankruptcy there; her name is ever good for any word in any language. It is worth a long hard, journey to take one of these drafts back to Nature and get the bullion for it, were it only to see what bottomless vaults of treasure there are where we pick up a few golden grains.

How transient, how babyish do all men and books, all philosophies and literatures appear, when we are alone with the stars, the sea, or the mountains! When we would get the best conception of the eternal we dismiss men, shut the books, and stand alone in the presence of these awful forms. Not a wrinkle on their brows, not a hoary hair upon their heads, yet as we stand there we reflect, *He* was before all these, and He shall "*fold them up as a vesture.*"

Nature too is a solace when men and books fail us. When the brain is fevered, the nerves jangled, God's providence a tangled labyrinth when the present seems to have swallowed up past and future, and the passing moment to be loaded down with the cares of a lifetime, we rush abroad among spring songs and odors, or among autumn leaves and under Indian summer skies, and how we fly into Nature's arms and are caught to her bosom! How the merry brook rebukes us, as we bend down and see our knotted brows mirrored in her laughing cheek; how the drowsy hum of the insects in the midsummer air stills the wild throb of the heart; how the tall pines, far aloft, seem to be whispering to each other of our folly; and how humbly can the true Christian then fall from nature's altar into the hands of his Father!

In this respect, we miss one great source of physical and spiritual vitality which our fathers in the itinerancy enjoyed when they gathered out the stones from what are now our rich and well-tilled fields. As they galloped around their long circuits they were much with nature, the forests rang with their hosannas, and birds and brooks and echoing rocks sent back

the chorus of their songs. But nature now does not thus come to us—we must go to her.*

When we go to nature herself, we are not to go to verify the theories of naturalist or artist or theologian. She is scared away by mallet and microscope and rigid cross-questioning. Not to find again what other men have found before, but to find nature herself, God's eldest youngest child, let us go, and we shall find her cheek ever fresh, her breath ever sweet, her voice ever melodious with greetings.

Men too are to be studied by the preacher. Myriads of skillfully forged sermons never struck a human heart, because they were never aimed at one; they were shot not at men but at theological manikins. Total depravity, as we read of it in certain creeds and catechisms, but never see, is an inky cloud that steamed up from yellow manuscripts and black letter tomes in the student's cloister. The laugh of a babe scatters it all away.

The physician, whatever he may have learned from his books, never prescribes for a patient till he has instituted a careful diagnosis; his medicines vary with the symptoms. And, moreover, the physician is not content with making up a prescription, he takes care that the patient takes the medicine; and if the stomach revolts, he changes or modifies accordingly; he condescends to sugar his pills if he must, and coax the remedy to the seat of the disease. But the moral physician often takes it for granted, without practical examination, that he knows the whole case; he assumes at once that the patient is afflicted with a multitude of spiritual diseases, some practitioners say with all possible maladies, and all chronic and congenital, and as he has settled it beforehand that the patient should and shall take the prescription, he mixes up pills, powders, and syrups indiscriminately and throws them at the poor patient's head! Diseases of the soul are as manifold in type and symptoms as those of the body, and we should not shrink from visiting the hospitals to study them out. We should mingle with wicked men as well as with the holy—I say not as much—for the preacher in the daily routine of pastoral duty generally works along through one stratum of human nature; he must break out from it above and below, if he would preach to men as

* This description was written for New England. A few paragraphs are not entirely applicable elsewhere.

they are. He will light on apt texts and meaty skeletons in the cars, the shop, and the mass-meeting. He must not be so bookish in his tastes, so sensitive or exquisite, as to be driven away from this duty by the effluvia of depravity; but must occasionally have something of the indifference of the surgeon among the odors of the dissecting room. Of course, in all this I presuppose the man to be a loyal Christian, loving God sincerely and hating sin with perfect hatred.

Christ compared his first preachers to fishermen. "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." The very word implies caution, patience, tact, a degree of shrewdness, a careful study of men, and as it were, insinuating the truth into them unawares. Who hunts for sharks with angle-worms, or for trout and pickerel with harpoon and lance? Yet have you never seen these fishers of men hanging bare hooks into the water and doggedly insisting that professional dignity would not allow them to use any bait? Let us not be ashamed to study the tastes, habits, yes, the very whims and caprices of the fish that we would catch, always of course making sure that in the bait there is a genuine, well-forged gospel hook.

"Knowing therefore the terrors of the Lord we *persuade men.*" Successful Christian preaching is simply the art of persuading men to come to Christ. Some men are hooked in the reason, some in the affections, some in the imagination, some in the conscience; some can be caught at the wedding, some at the funeral, some in the street and some at the home, some in their business, and some in their pleasures; we must know the fishing grounds well to know where to spread the nets. It is not *man* that we labor to save, but *men;* and if successful it will not be by appealing to *man*, which is an abstraction crystalized from a thousand generalizations, but to *men*, as they breathe, laugh, and weep around us.

Nothing is unministerial that will let us into the hiding-places of human nature. We must not be too fearful of soiling the professional uniform, or of cracking the buckram of professional dignity. We do not preach to maintain ministerial dignity, but to save souls.

Here we are in great danger of falling behind our fathers, who, having little leisure for attention to books, compensated themselves by the study of men, and therefore, though they

sometimes shot a ragged shaft, it generally flew straight to the joint of the harness; while to-day, many a silver bow delivers a graceful arrow into empty air.

Paul shrunk not from adapting himself to men's weaknesses and prejudices. "I become all things to all men, if by any means I may save some." See with what exquisite tact and adaptation the discourses are arranged, which are skeletoned and outlined in the book of Acts. For example, it is instructive to compare the discourse delivered in the midst of the mob, on the stairs of the tower of Antonia, with the discourse preached among the Epicureans and Stoics on Mars' Hill. In both instances the most delicate tact and skillful management of topics and hearers were required to get any hearing at all. Both discourses were abruptly broken off by the impatience and passion of his audience, the one with cries of mockery and contempt, the other with cries of rage and revenge; and this he doubtless expected, but how much truth did he succeed in inculcating before the storm burst. The Athenians he addresses in the rounded periods of their native dialect, the most perfect vehicle of thought ever invented by man, far different from the tangled and involved sentences which abound in his epistles, which yet were equally adapted to the readers, in whom Greek and Aramean styles of thought and speech were mingled. On the other hand, the Jewish mob that swayed about the castle stairs could have understood Greek. Paul had just addressed the Roman Lysias in Greek; but when he turned to his countrymen he addressed them in the nervous triliterals of their native tongue, every word of which was fragrant with the sacred incense, every epithet and accent was steeped in the hallowed associations of that temple worship, for which they were then burning with such frantic zeal, and so every sentence as it fell down through the air peopled the sacred area with the awful forms of patriarchs and prophets from whose loins they gloried to have sprung; "and when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue, they kept the more silence." On the Areopagus he commences, "Athenians," the customary address of the Greek orators, (*ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*;) at Jerusalem, "Brethren and Fathers."* How cold would "Men

* Ἄνδρες should not be translated in either case; cf. *ἄνδρες δικασταὶ, βουλευταὶ, ἔφοροις*, etc., in Demos., etc., rendered simply "Judges," etc.

of Israel" have sounded from the lips of a Jewish orator at the national home, and how inappropriate would the epithet "Fathers" have been in Paul's lips when he stood before the bearded sages of the Porch and the garden! In both discourses the very first paragraph brings the main thought into view; he is to rebuke idolatry at Athens, Hebrew narrowness and insulation at Jerusalem; yet the first paragraph of each conveys a delicate compliment, soothing and almost flattering, while still the Christian keeps complete mastery over the orator. Our translation of the Athenian discourse makes the exordium harsh and abrupt; "*too superstitious*" would never be flung at an audience in a Pauline exordium; the true rendering is "more devout," (than other people,*) or "more careful in matters of religion." In the discourse at Jerusalem, the first thing that he does is to appear to commend their zeal, as he tells them that he had once felt the same fiery glow, "zealous toward God, as ye all are this day." The storm raging around him reminds him of that sultry mid-day on the road to Damascus, when his heart had last thirsted for Christian blood. How naturally, how gracefully he glides up to his theme, first presenting its fairest side, then slowly turning it around before them! In both instances he carefully avoids giving a rude shock to the prejudices of his hearers, though in the one case preaching to idolaters, and in the other to the murderers of his Master. He gently apologizes for the error of the Athenians, while yet he pointedly rebukes it: "the times of this ignorance God winked at." Discoursing to the philosophers he begins at the origin of things, and so holds their attention as he advances steadily to the account of the grand distant consummation, and Christ the Judge. Discoursing to the Jews who had been fed on Moses's Law and David's Psalms, he plunges at once into personal religious experience. Athens worshiped beauty and gloried in her artists, who had evoked with pen and pencil and chisel forms of immortal grace and loveliness; and from the Areopagus Paul points to the statues about him, "the temples made with hands;" the Parthenon was before him, and the colossal Minerva lifted its spear above the Acropolis. He points to forms of beauty which are still the

* Cf. Winer, Gram. of N. T. De Wette says, "*gottesfürchtig*;" Stier and Theile "*gar andächtig*." So Robinson, Conybeare, and Howson.

pride of the whole earth, and quotes their own Poet's line to fasten the truth in the understanding. Jerusalem, too, gloried in her temple, not for its architectural splendors, but for its holy memories and its awful shekinah; and it was in that very temple, "in a trance," he assures them, that he had received his commission from the God of their fathers, as their own prophet, in the same sacred place, amid the crying seraphim and the moving doorposts; had seen through the altar smoke "the Lord upon his throne," and as the coal swung from the brazen altar, in the seraph's hand, touched his lips, he cried, "Here am I, send me."

We are not attempting anything like an analysis of these discourses, but one thing more may be noticed in illustration of the trait under consideration; with what tact and judgment the most offensive truth is reserved till the road for its advance is well laid and paved. God revealed in Christ, and the fact demonstrated by the resurrection, is the truth toward which he cautiously but steadily advances, from the first sentence, on the Areopagus; but as soon as he reached it all the Greek prejudices burst forth in a storm of scorn; but the shot had told. Dionysius and Damaris, and others with them, were slain. The mission of the Gospel to the Gentiles was to be made known to the bigoted and fanatical Jews at Jerusalem; but he cautiously avoids allusion to it in two places where it would naturally come in, and where it does come in when he relates the same incidents under other circumstances, namely, in the description of the miraculous vision on the way to Damascus, and in the account of the visit of Ananias. But he says nothing whatever of this till he reaches the temple trance, the moving door-posts, and the crying seraphim. This is but a brief illustration of the example which this "chief of the apostles" everywhere sets us in the delicate handling of human nature.

If we treat of the preacher's use of *books*, where shall we begin, and where shall we end? No other profession is helped by an acquaintance with all kinds of books so much as that of the preacher. The physician can lay out certain sciences as of no value to him professionally; so can the advocate; but the theologian sees religious truths interwoven through them all, and the preacher (in distinction from the scientific theologian)

can glean illustrations and arguments, invaluable in reaching certain classes of mind, from any province of human thought. From the profoundest speculations of philosophy up through all the tiers of human thought and feeling, to the lightest productions of imagination, there is no layer of fact, fancy, or speculation into which he may not work with profit to them that hear him. How wondrously discursive was the reading of Jeremy Taylor and John Wesley! A man must read much for which he has no taste, some things that he hates and loathes, to find out what the people are thinking about, and to know on what paths to approach them. This is simply finding where the mark lies at which he would aim his arrow. And to do this safely, he must have a trained taste and judgment, as well as a godly heart. He must sometimes taste noxious blasphemies and deadly infidelities, just as a physician must sometimes experiment with poison to know what antidotes to administer. His intellectual as well as his spiritual constitution must be robust enough for this work, or some fatal malaria may spread destruction among his flock. To read the arguments of an objector, merely as they are set down in a standard theological work, is unjust to objector, writer, and reader. March into the enemy's own territory, take his blows in full force upon your buckler, and see if your armor is of the right temper. If it gives way, go back to the armory, get equipped anew, and march up again. He who thus does full justice to both friend and foe will find that most valuable treatises on the evidences of Christianity have been written by our enemies. Heathen and infidel literature is a magazine of weapons for the Christian warrior; some of his most invulnerable armor has been cast in the very furnaces of Satanic depravity.

Variety of books enlarges and enriches our vocabulary also, as well as our stock of ideas; it saves our language from professional cant and narrowness. Words are our weapons, and they should be skillfully selected from a wide range of reading and conversation.

"Some books are to be tasted," says Bacon, and thus far we have alluded mainly to such. But when we come to seek books that are to be "chewed and digested," obviously we want such as will go to make muscle, cartilage, and bone. We may sip at the little books, but we should live on great books. It ought

to be unnecessary to urge upon clergymen the duty of close and profound study of the greatest of all books, the book both divine and human, like our Lord and Master; yet how much more time is spent among commentaries and systematic theologies, through which the precious drops filter slowly, one by one, than at the gushing fountain head! While reading is so abundant, great books, worth "chewing and digesting," are fortuately few, and by laying hold on these we get the concentrated aliment, and so save ourselves from rummaging over the cart-loads of chaff, through which the same wheat kernels are scattered, in the inferior grades of grain. No man will drink at a brawling, shallow, muddy brook, when a few steps will take him up to the clear, deep, quiet spring. One dialogue of Plato yields the golden grains which you find beaten out thin to gild whole libraries of natural theology. Bengel's little Gnomon gives you the marrow of a shelf full of average commentaries. Read a page of such a book and you get up to walk the room; you feel the need of exercise to digest what you have swallowed.

Time is a great expurgator, stern and inexorable, but just in the main. As a general rule, the books live that deserve to live. If we go into a library where Time has winnowed for one or two centuries, we are sure of finding aliment. The books that he leaves, after rummaging the shelves for a thousand years, are the quintessence of human thought and feeling.

But great books are to be *studied* to yield real profit, and to study the mind must be trained. Only he who closes in with such books as these in close steady grapple, feels their strength. The passing glance cannot detect their glory; it is revealed only to the steady, deliberate gaze of patient thought. And patient, accurate, continuous thinking is the highest fruit of the culture that we advocate. Besides, to be fully appreciated, such books as these are to be read in the language in which they were written. No really great book was ever really translated. The aroma has exhaled when the precious juice has been decanted into another vessel.

And how much time has the preacher, when fairly launched upon professional life, to acquire languages, or form habits of patient, persevering thought? How much time do the most

industrious preachers find to keep up such habits when formed? The sermons are to be prepared for the next Sunday, the sick are to be ministered unto, clamoring souls are to be fed, the church is to be paid for, enlarged, or repaired, a parsonage is to be built, the finances are to be engineered, belligerent brethren are to be wept over and prayed over; when a true man is fairly in this work he hears the cry for the bread of life all around him, every moment. We repeat again, these habits are to be formed, and as a general thing will be formed, if at all, before proper professional life commences.

Finally, the preacher should have at command many facts and truths which he never uses, in order to give those which he does use the greatest efficiency. A broad and generous culture, a gleaning in all the fields of thought and feeling, not only enables a man to hold up his theme in a thousand cross-lights, which all tell on the hearer, though not explained to him; not only spreads before him manifold fields of illustration, and furnishes manifold points of contact with the human nature with which he deals; but it gives the hearer a vivid though indefinite idea of the richness of the theme, by suggesting that the speaker has sunk one shaft through beds of treasure, when there is abundant room for thousands more all around. The circle of facts and truths, which the speaker chooses to set in array, presses far more strongly on the mind of the hearer if it is felt to be not the full circle which the speaker has at command, but only a small arc of a great circle whose center is remote within the man, or rather a small segment of the great sphere of truth, which he could, if he would, set rolling down upon the conscience and understanding of the listener. As we listen, or read, we love to feel that we are borne on by a stream of thought and feeling in full headway; it is unpleasant to feel that the reservoir is almost empty; and it is far more pleasant to be conscious that the stream comes from a fountain than from a reservoir. Hence the old rhetoricians warn us against exhausting the theme; it is proverbially disagreeable to listen to one who "tells all he knows." There should be masses behind, to constantly feed the columns that deploy in front, and there should be a reserved corps that never takes the field, except in desperate emergences. Troops which have never fought have won many a battle. How much

stronger is the impression when we feel that the man could have said as much more! Ordinary discourses often produce a profound impression from having this one characteristic; many that are skillful and elaborate fail for lack of this. How artfully, how sublimely does Milton enhance the grandeur of Immanuel's triumph, as

> "O'er shields, and helms, and helmèd heads he rode,
> Of Thrones and mighty Seraphim prostrate,"

when he adds as the final stroke,

> "Yet half his strength he put not forth, *but checked*
> *His thunder in mid-volley.*"

Let the reader or hearer see that there is a great body of fact, argument, and illustration lying behind, ready to march forward at a moment's notice, and every blow struck has tenfold power, for each advancing fact, argument, or illustration is seen not to be a solitary straggling combatant, but the head of a column which presses up behind. This army of reserve lies back in the man; you feel that it is there as you listen, though he does not tell you so; yet now and then the heads of the columns come in sight, as a careless look or gesture seems just marshaling them for action. Before such a speaker you often surrender, not to the blow that is struck, but to the blow you see ready to fall.

Now this is an impression which can never be counterfeited, at least in the presence of a hearer who possesses ordinary discernment. We remember a good brother who, when he had turned upside down and wrong-side out every thought on which he could lay his hand, was accustomed to retreat into a peroration something like this: "Volumes might be uttered on this interesting theme," or "Vast fields of thought open all around me;" but the ruse (if it were a ruse) never took even with the weakest; everybody knew then that the pond was dry. The impression of reserved forces is produced unconsciously, if produced at all. There is a certain alacrity and vigor with which thoughts step forward, when detached from the mass of thought waiting in reserve, and when, besides, they advance under cover of great batteries of feeling and sympathy waiting also in reserve; and this no art can counterfeit.

These resources must be stored away in the man. Not the man's tongue, but the man must be filled with the theme.

We have been endeavoring to sketch an Ideal at which every young man should aim who proposes to enter our ministry, and which it is the duty of the Church to help him attain. We have endeavored to show that the calling exercises all the faculties of a thoroughly developed man, and this every preacher should aim to be, to the full extent of his providential advantages. All these resources from Nature, Men, and Books, resources operative and latent, power active and reserved, must be stored in the man, must form the substratum of his speech, thought, and emotion, that he may be "perfect, thoroughly furnished." The interests of the ministry, the interests of the Church that we would serve, of the world that we would save, and the Lord of the vineyard himself, all demand that such an Ideal should be steadily held up before candidates for the ministry. We may be long in reaching the practical realization; but if we have a correct Ideal, our efforts will at least be in the right direction. We may not have strength enough in the bow to send the shaft to the mark; but if it be aimed aright it will at least fall toward the mark, and so direct the aim of others who come up behind us, who may succeed where we have practically failed.

No other employment is so noble as that of the Christian ministry; this all the world concedes. No man, no set of men contests this claim. It is equally true that no other employment, to insure the highest success, demands such full development, such strength and symmetry of character. To be an embassador for God, to represent God to the world, man should be a whole man, filled with the Holy Ghost. To be a counselor, an advocate, a military officer, to command a ship or an army, man must train himself for years; and is less culture required for the highest work man can do on this planet? Would Bacon's learning have been too vast, would Milton's imagination have been too lofty, would Aristotle's reasoning have been too cogent, would Cicero's tongue have been too eloquent, to cope with the depravity of this world and persuade men to be reconciled to God? Let all be combined in one and baptized with the Holy Ghost, and how far is the man beneath his work in grandeur and dignity! Man may do

honor to any other profession; but no man stands high enough from native or acquired powers to do honor to this. What being did God ever create that would not be dignified, ennobled, by being appointed embassador to a world? The man who will lightly assume or lightly lay by these robes is a trifler whose tread pollutes the Holy of Holies. The calling demands an undivided mind and heart and life, all the culture that schools or books or the world can give; all the moral energy, faith, and love that can be brought down from heaven; and after all these, the preacher who is worthy of his calling cries out, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

Art. II.—THE MORAL CONDITION OF INFANTS.

We do not hesitate in affirming the salvation of all infants dying in infancy. For, 1. Infants are innocent of all voluntary violation of God's law, and consequently uncondemned and uncondemnable. 2. Being uncondemned, there is no *legal* impediment in the way of their restoration to spiritual life, or rather the impartation to them of spiritual life in regeneration, if it please God to impart this grace in infancy. 3. Being passive in God's hands, they can offer no resistance to any work which he may choose to perform in them by his Holy Spirit as preparatory to the heavenly state. 4. They, in common with all human beings, are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and are graciously entitled to eternal life, and also to a meetness for heaven, either actually imparted or else placed within reach in probation. 5. As those dying in infancy are never placed upon probation, God stands graciously pledged to save them unconditionally.

And here we may safely leave them, assured that no human being will ever be deprived of his right, through Christ, to eternal life, except by his own fault in a voluntary rejection of Christ, or an equivalent refusal of such terms as may be offered in the dispensation under which he lives. The child dying in infancy has an indisputable title to the heavenly inheritance, and to an unconditional preparation for its enjoyment. But it

does not follow that all children have in all respects the same claim. Nor does it follow that even those dying in infancy come into the world regenerate; nor that they are "born of the Spirit" as soon as they are "born of the flesh;" but only that this spiritual birth takes place before death.

We are perfectly at liberty, then, to inquire, what is the moral, or rather spiritual condition of a human being up to that period where infancy passes into responsible agency—the period where probation begins? Infancy or its equivalent continues up to that period, but not, strictly speaking, beyond it. Does the child, or does he not, enter upon probation in a regenerate state?

An idea, vague, undefined, almost without form, has long existed in some minds, that, in virtue of the atonement, a gracious state substantially the same as the new birth, is the birthright inheritance of every descendant of Adam. A posthumous and unfinished work of the pious and gifted Mercein has given partial form and expression to this idea; and the names of F. G. Hibbard and Gilbert Haven, names loved and honored in our Israel, have given it additional currency. Still, it is not yet very well developed, nor very accurately defined. It lacks completeness of detail and distinctness of outline. This is to be regretted. If the doctrine is true, and especially if, as Mr. Haven somewhat exultantly claims, Methodism is to have the honor of reforming the theology of Christendom upon this point, we ought to know just what we are receiving or rejecting, advocating or opposing.

It will be our aim in this discussion to deal candidly with these writers, and to charge them with holding no views which they do not distinctly avow, though at times their language may seem to imply much more. Still, we shall feel perfectly at liberty to point out the logical tendency of their views, and to follow them out to their legitimate results.

There are two points of primary importance, which are so distinctly avowed that the meaning cannot be mistaken. One relates to the moral effect resulting to infancy from the atonement, the other to the period at which this effect is produced. A third point, relating to the extent of this effect, is stated with equal distinctness, yet is not decidedly avowed as forming a part of the theory, and probably would not be without some

important limitations; though, as will be seen, it is the necessary complement of the theory, imperatively demanded by the system of interpretation adopted by these brethren.

1. It is distinctly claimed that infants are in a regenerate state—a state in every thing essential, identical with that resulting from the new birth in the case of adults.

Mr. Mercein says:*

> The law assigns as one of the penalties of evil its self-perpetuation, its inability to every virtue, and its insensibility to, and forfeiture of, spiritual influences. The atonement withdraws this penalty, and gives, in germ at least, and a new birth, the elements of purity with a capability of growth, under influences adapted to our spiritual constitution. In other words, *the atonement regenerates.* These are precisely the benefits conferred in adult conversion.—P. 13.

Mr. Haven, who is bold almost to recklessness in his statements, says:

> To be a son of Adam till we willfully cast away our birthright is to be in Christ a son of God.—P. 9.

Again he says:

> It must be possible for God, *it is his duty*, through the atonement of Christ, so to impart of the regenerating grace that flows from justification to the new-born soul, that it may grow in the likeness of its God and Saviour, and, never knowing the hour when he was engrafted into him, may always be conscious of the life of God in his soul.—P. 12.

Mr. Hibbard is more elaborate, perhaps more cautious, in his language, but not less explicit. He defines "regeneration" to be "*life*—the *life of God* in human nature." And after showing some of the circumstances under which this life is received by adults, goes on to say,

> But does all this prove that in infants there cannot and does not exist a principle of divine life, a seminal regeneration, graciously imparted, or begotten, of the same quality or nature, and from the same efficient source of life as that in adults? differing indeed in extent and force, and in the circumstances and conditions of bestowment, but not in essence, quality, or efficacy.—P. 647.

* The quotations from Mercein and Haven are taken from Mr. Haven's article in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for January, 1859. Those from Mr. Hibbard are taken from the Quarterly for October, 1859. References are made accordingly.

Quotations to the same effect might be greatly multiplied, but it is needless.

2. Another point claimed by these writers is, that the effects of the atonement upon our nature, whatever those effects may be, are coincident with the effects of the fall.

Mr. Mercein says:

> From the moment that the law was broken the atonement became operative in Adam and his race.—P. 13.

Mr. Haven says:

> Our connection with Adam corrupts and ruins us at our *conception;* our connection with the second Adam restores us to as fair a condition at the same point as it would have been had the first parents kept their first estate.—P. 10.

Mr. Hibbard says:

> We take the ground that children are reckoned to Christ and his Church; that as soon as their distinct entity or individuality is established, as soon as they become human, possessed of a human soul and endued with the faculties (undeveloped) of a moral being, as soon as the *ego* of percipient existence is formed, so that the capacity for moral happiness or misery becomes a property or possibility of being, so soon the human soul comes within the all comprehensive and gracious provisions of the atonement. The date of redemptive power and grace to each individual of our race is coincident with the date of existence.—P. 635.

Again,

> Whatever effects flowed from Adam's sin, or from Christ's righteousness, to the human family, flowed to infants, as such, in the first instance. They flowed to our *humanity*, our *common nature*, our *race*, and they reached human nature at the moment it became *human*.—P. 636.

3. Another point clearly set forth by these writers is, that the actual effects of the atonement are not only commensurate with the effects of the fall, completely counteracting, neutralizing those effects, but that they superabound beyond them.

Mr. Haven, as already quoted, says:

> Our connection with the second Adam restores us to as fair a condition . . . as it would have been had the first parents kept their first estate.

A little further on he says:

Christ died for the race. By virtue of that death the curse entailed on it by Adam was removed from each soul, until the soul voluntarily adopted it as its own.—P. 17.

Mr. Hibbard says:

The apostle employs the terms *life* and *death* to set forth the effects of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness upon the human race.—P. 636.

In this connection he says further,

The *grace* is not only co-extensive with the death and counteracts it, but it superabounds and overflows. . . . Whatever, therefore, is the effect of Adam's sin upon our race, denoted by the term "*death*" we find its sovereign antidote and opposite in the effect of the grace of Christ, denoted by the terms "*life*" and the "*receiving abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness.*" If the "*grace*" the "*gift of righteousness*," and "*life*," do not annul the death sentence and restore to life, and even go beyond it, the argument [of St. Paul] means nothing: is merely a deceptive hyperbole.—P. 637.

Again,

Whatever that "condemnation" was, as to its legal or moral effect upon our race, it was effectually removed by the efficacious righteousness of Christ, and a "justification to life" was bestowed in its stead. . . . The justification covers all the condemned, and reverses the "judgment" which stands against us, at the first moment when it would take effect.—P. 638.

It must be that these passages mean more than the writers intended, yet not more than the theory under consideration demands, as will be seen hereafter. But it was no doubt the intention of the authors to teach, that the effect of grace is to regenerate human nature in the same moment in which it becomes depraved, to impart spiritual life in the moment of spiritual death; or, in other words, that it meets and vanquishes death at the instant of his assault upon our incipient humanity, imparting life to that humanity at the very moment of its inception. Thus, death never actually takes place until it is brought on by voluntary transgression. Upon this point we take issue with them.

In settling such questions as this, our ultimate appeal is not, as Mr. Hibbard justly says, to human opinions or church tradition, but to the word of God. Yet is it not quite possible to set aside too readily the godly judgment of men equal at least to ourselves in learning, piety, and spiritual discernment? to

treat too lightly the concurrent opinion of the Christian Church? The question before us is simply a question of fact, and if the Scriptures give clear and relevant testimony, that testimony is conclusive. Human opinions must yield to it, and the facts of human life-history be interpreted accordingly. But if there is reasonable ground to doubt the meaning or relevancy of the Scriptures adduced in support of the new theory, then we are bound to question closely these facts, to consider attentively the spiritual phenomena presented. Indeed, these spiritual phenomena are the divinely authenticated exponents of the spiritual state, the fruit infallibly indicating the character of the tree producing it. What, then, are the Scriptures, and what the facts bearing on this question?

There are two classes of Scripture mainly relied upon by the advocates of the doctrine in question. One class consists of such passages as refer expressly to children in connection with the Christian character and life, the other of such as treat of the provisions made in the Gospel for the salvation of all men, embracing infants of course.

The former class contains the acts and sayings of our Lord upon two different occasions: one described in Matt. xviii, 2–6; Mark ix, 36, 37; Luke ix, 47, 48; the other Matt. xix, 13–15; Mark x, 13–16; and Luke xviii, 15–17. Some of these sayings are considered equivalent to a direct assertion of the doctrine. Of course, this interpretation assumes that the children concerned were mere infants; and though serious doubts are known to exist in regard to it, we are not disposed, for any purposes of the present discussion, to call this assumption in question. Indeed, upon the authority of other Scriptures, whether Christ affirms it of infants in these sayings or not, we should contend that "of such is the kingdom of God."

There are but two passages in these sayings of our Lord that have really any immediate bearing upon the question, admitting all that is claimed for them. These are, "of such is the kingdom of God;" and, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

The first of these passages, if the children spoken of were really infants, undoubtedly means, that such is the relation of infants to the covenant of grace as to bring them clearly within

its provisions as subjects of Christ's kingdom. As such they are entitled to "heaven and immortal glory," with whatever change, physical or moral, is necessary to fit them for the heavenly inheritance. This title, however, does not give a claim to present possession, but is rather that of heirs presumptive; as, according to either view of their moral state, actual possession, whether present or prospective, becomes conditional at the moment when probation begins. According to our view, a personal exercise of faith in Christ is required of every probationer from the moment he becomes such, in order to a *continuance* of the regenerate state; according to the other view, such exercise of faith in Christ becomes necessary from the same moment, in order to the *attainment* of a regenerate state. In the one view of the case a personal compliance with the Gospel conditions secures the development and growth of the germ of spiritual life; in the other view of the case such compliance secures the implantation of that germ; but in neither view is the living infant "made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light." For, whatever our Saviour may mean by affirming that "of such is the kingdom of heaven," he certainly does not mean that such are now in actual possession of heavenly bliss and glory, nor that they are, either in body or intellect, prepared for their enjoyment. Why, then, are we bound to consider them morally fit? True, it may be said that they are now in possession of the germ of a physical meetness, and hence, according to analogy, we must presume them to be in possession of a like germ of moral meetness. But this is assuming the very point in dispute. And the analogy fails for this simple reason, that human nature is not now what it was when it came from the hands of its Maker. It is not what it was, unless, indeed, the Atonement restores it to its pristine state, a view of the case which we shall have occasion to consider hereafter.

According to either view, then, the actual blessings of this relation to the "kingdom of God," whatever that relation may imply, are wholly prospective at the time when the relation is formed. According to either view, too, the title to those blessings expires by limitation at that point where infancy passes into responsible agency, unless renewed at that point, and perpetuated thereafter by personal compliance with the terms

of salvation proposed in the Gospel. And if so, why does it not meet all the requirements of our Lord's declaration to say, that, under the provisions of the Gospel covenant, such is the relation of humanity to the divine government, that every human being during infancy is an heir of immortality, is in possession of an indisputable title through Christ to the heavenly inheritance?

And it may not be amiss to say, in passing, that though the covenanted *blessings* are prospective, the *title* to those blessings is present; and, as a consequence, the infant has a legitimate claim to the baptismal sealing which the covenant contemplates. And as a further consequence, such sealing cannot be innocently withheld longer than is strictly necessary to meet the conditions which the circumstances of the case may impose.

If there is any meaning in this passage besides that which we have just been considering, it is substantially the same as that of the other passage named as having an apparent bearing upon the general question. Or rather, the latter may be regarded as following the former as a corollary, thus: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" therefore, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Speaking with reference to this latter passage, Mr. Hibbard says that our Lord "presents them as models of the genuine spirit and qualities of discipleship."

Now in order to the best possible appreciation of this remark, we must bear it in mind, that Mr. Hibbard is writing expressly concerning the "moral condition of infants," affirming them to be in a regenerate state from the moment they become "human;" or, according to Mr. Haven, from the moment of their "conception." It is the same state of which this latter writer asserts,

> There is a Christian generation, spiritual and divine, congenital with the carnal and human, inwrought in that soul at its very origin, by which we have a counter life of holy impulses, and can grow after the model of the immaculate Son of God.—P. 12.

The question very naturally arises here, At what period of infancy are we to look for the manifestation of these model qualities? If the Christian character were merely negative,

we should of course look to that period when the infant first comes within the range of our observation, for then its manifested character is about as near zero as that of any living thing well can be. And it must be confessed, that as character develops, the peevishness, perverseness, stubbornness, selfishness, deceitfulness, dishonesty, so common if not universal in childhood, rather disqualify these little ones for *models* even of the negative graces.

It may be answered that the manifestation of such traits does not disprove infant regeneration, for adult Christians have the same evils to contend with, and are not always successful. But the question here is, Are they objects of imitation? Did our Lord mean that to enter the kingdom of heaven men must become like little children in these respects? The truth is, that as childhood approaches adult age the lamb-like innocence of infancy fades away, and just in proportion as the human predominates over the animal nature, just in that proportion do the dark stains of native depravity become manifest.

Thus, as the child-character becomes positive instead of negative merely, it becomes less and less suitable for imitation. Negative innocence does not unfold into positive holiness, but the contrary; so that, if infancy fails as a model for the negative graces, much more does it fail, at every stage, as a model for the positive graces. Certainly no one would think a Christian character maturing into perfectness in proportion as it became childish. St. Paul says, "When I became a man, I put away childish things;" but if children are models, when he became a Christian he should have resumed them.

No, it cannot be that our Saviour's meaning is, that, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, we must become like little children in *all respects;* but only that we should become like them in certain particulars. There are traits in childhood, in very early childhood, as there are in the lamb and the dove, that very beautifully illustrate certain Christian graces; and children are therefore used for this purpose, not by Christ only, but by several inspired writers. We cannot fail to remark, however, that most of the graces thus illustrated are either wholly negative or such as contain a large negative element, or else are such as belong to the beginning and progress of the religious life, to spiritual infancy.

We cannot see, therefore, that in either of the cases under consideration our Lord either affirms or denies, directly or indirectly, the doctrine of infant regeneration.

The other class of Scriptures mainly relied upon by the advocates of this doctrine embraces all such as describe the Gospel provisions made for man as such. From among these, Mr. Hibbard has selected that remarkable passage in the writings of St. Paul, Romans chapter fifth, from the twelfth verse to the end. He has evidently studied it with care, and has expounded it with learning and ability, but upon a wrong theory.

There can be no controversy concerning the persons embraced in the gracious provisions set forth in this passage; for it is agreed that *all* are embraced; all the descendants of Adam. If one is redeemed, all are redeemed. If salvation is provided for one, it is provided for all. Or rather, it is not for men severally and as individuals merely that salvation is provided, but for the race, for humanity as such. And upon just such Scriptures as these is based the indisputable claim of every human being to eternal life, either unconditionally bestowed, or else placed within reach by probation. The question, then, is not, For whom does the Gospel provide? but, What is the effect of that provision? That *human nature* is redeemed, is not only admitted but claimed. But is human nature so restored in Christ, that every one bearing that nature enters upon existence in a regenerate state?

Neither can there be any controversy concerning the period at which humanity comes within the provisions of grace. It is urged that depravity mingles with the current of human nature as it flows down from father to son through all generations of men, from Adam to his latest posterity; that the spiritual part of man, in which it inheres, is propagated along with the material structure, so that it is, of course, congenital, or rather co-embryonic. And it is also agreed, that humanity comes within the provisions of grace in that same moment when it is reached by depravity; or, in other words, that humanity *is* within the provisions of grace from the moment of its beginning.

But as it does not follow, that, because all adults during the whole period of their probation are redeemed—are fully covered by the provisions of grace—they are therefore all regene-

rate, so neither does it follow that infants are regenerate because they are redeemed—because that during the whole period of infancy their case is fully covered by the provisions of grace. Provision for an end is a fact very different from the actual attainment of that end. Grace provides amply for the salvation of every son and daughter of Adam, yet it is a melancholy truth, that multitudes voluntarily reject those provisions and are never saved.

Speaking of this argument of Paul as bearing upon the doctrine under consideration, Mr. Hibbard says:

> As, therefore, the design of the apostle was to discuss the very question at issue, his argument, whatever it is, must be not only relevant to our purpose, but decisive.—P. 636.

Of course, if we admit Mr. Hibbard's view of Paul's design the question is settled. If the design of Paul was to discuss and prove the doctrine of Infant Regeneration, we can have no more to say; we must receive his conclusions as final. And we cannot but wonder that after making this discovery, Mr. Hibbard should have labored on through fourteen pages more, in an effort to supplement the argument of St. Paul, to prove over again what he had so conclusively proved in the space of ten verses.

But, if these arguments and statements of St. Paul mean the regeneration of infants, the actual and unconditional impartation of spiritual life to universal infant humanity, then they mean much more than this. They mean more, perhaps, than the advocates of this doctrine would intentionally claim; though not more than they have claimed, and *must* claim upon their theory of interpreting these Scriptures.

For, 1. As already seen, the gracious provisions described comprehend our entire humanity, at every stage of its being from its inception to the close of probation, and, in the case of the saved, to the consummation of their salvation in heaven. 2. They contemplate the recovery of all that was lost in Adam's fall, either in kind or its equivalent, so that no ultimate loss shall accrue to any human being merely as a consequence of Adam's sin. "Nay, 'much more' hath this grace 'abounded.' It is 'not only coextensive' in its provisions with Adam's sin in its effects, 'but it superabounds and overflows.'"

There may be some difference of opinion, however, as to the particulars in which "it superabounds and overflows." We have supposed it to be mainly in this: that in addition to salvation from the consequences of the first transgression, it provides salvation from all the evils resulting from our own personal offenses; that the benefits flowing from "the obedience of one," are not measured by the "*one* man's disobedience," but abound to the many: not coextensive with the one man's *one sin* only, but abound to the "*many offenses*" of the offenders. But it may be, that in the seventeenth verse the apostle intends to give intimation of a higher state of blessedness than that forfeited by transgression. Indeed, this seems to be, in Mr. Hibbard's estimation, the leading idea of superabounding grace, especially as set forth in this verse. But according to his views, this higher blessedness does not seem to belong so much to the future as the present; not so much to the final glory of the righteous as to the present moral elevation, or rather renovation of universal human nature. And in reference to the teaching of this verse he says, "if the 'grace,' the 'gift of righteousness' and 'life,' do not annul the death sentence and restore life, and even go beyond it, the argument means nothing." If this language does not mean that grace actually restores to "our humanity" a higher "life" than that lost in the fall, then it "means nothing." And if Paul's language means infant regeneration at all, it must mean just what Mr. Hibbard says it means. It must mean, that in Christ all human beings are restored in all respects to more than their pristine excellence, to more than Adamic sinlessness and blessedness.

If the effect of grace, as described in this class of Scriptures, is unconditional and immediate upon our nature, then is man at once fully restored. Yea, in that same instant in which the taint and curse of sin touch him is he made to shine in brighter purity, and raised to higher blessedness than would have been his if his progenitors had never sinned. And, as the poison is neutralized, and more than neutralized, at the moment of contact with "our humanity," it follows that the poison never takes effect, humanity never feels it, but only feels the superabounding grace. Then, truly, the infant mind is no blank sheet to be blurred or beautified by vice or virtue,

but is already written all over with characters of light and love. Pelagianism is quite too negative for this theory, falls far short of it.

Then, too, no sinner can beget a child in his own likeness, for grace is there to neutralize and more than neutralize depravity, and thus prevent its transmission. Or if transmitted, it is only as it is accompanied at every moment by the more than effectual antidote. And if, as Mr. Haven tells us, "the hellish powers are dragged away from the infantile throat and heavenly powers surround him," there can be no good reason why any human being should ever become a sinner, or should have a sinful nature to transmit to posterity. A moral necessity for it there can be none; for "whatever that 'condemnation' was, as to its legal or moral effect upon our race, it was effectually removed by the efficacious righteousness of Christ." Psychical necessity there can be none; for "our connection with the second Adam restores us to as fair a condition at the same point as it would have been had the first parents kept the first estate." Necessity of circumstances there can be none; for, according to the last quoted writer, Haven, "whatever be the faith of the parent, the undeveloped faith of the child is Christian. . . . The atonement spreads its wings of healing over every cradle in every clime."—P. 9. And, "with the hellish powers dragged away from the infantile throat, and the heavenly powers surrounding him, he grows to a sense of his nature and responsibility, his dangers and duties, and in perfect freedom amid the contending powers makes his decisions; and thus proceeds through his probationary career, till his choice is fixed in the full exercise of the same freedom through his eternal being."—P. 10.

No matter, then, whether the parent be pagan, Mohammedan or infidel, "the undeveloped faith of the child is Christian," and will of course as naturally develop into a Christian character and life as the acorn into the oak. And being so securely guarded up to the time of deciding upon his future course, and then and thereafter so perfectly free, is it not strange that "there is no man that sinneth not?" that "if we say we have not sinned we make him a liar, and his word is not in us?" It would seem, indeed, that all *have* "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," that the fearful Adamic tragedy

is re-enacted in each succeeding generation, and in every individual case.

In accordance with this same class of views, we must suppose the intellect cleared of the clouds that obscure it as a consequence of our fallen state. Whether the effect of sin upon the mind is organic or merely functional, so to speak, whether the disorders of the mind are to be considered under the head of Psychology or Physiology, or both, are questions of no importance here. Superabounding grace must be supposed to correct all these disorders, and raise our whole nature to a higher state of excellence than that in which Adam was created. Yea, even the material part of man is improved, for "where sin abounded" in its effects upon either soul or body, there "grace did much more abound." Of course, hereditary disease is as impossible as hereditary depravity, or rather, it is as effectually counteracted at the moment of inception, else "we are" *not* "restored to as fair a condition as it would have been had the first parents kept their first estate." More than this: the infant cannot suffer, cannot die. Suffering and death become an impossibility during infancy, and can never take place until infancy is past, and the newly made probationers "slay themselves by voluntary co-operation with the tempter."

"The apostle," says Mr. Hibbard, "employs the terms *life* and *death* to set forth the effects of Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness upon the human race." He then proves by quotations from verses 12, 15, 17, and 21, that *death* is the effect of Adam's sin, and its opposite, *life*, the effect of Christ's righteousness. In the course of this proof he claims that "*death* here denotes moral or spiritual death, as well as the death of the body." And to this death, he says, Paul "opposes as direct antithesis" the life spoken of in verses 17 and 21. *Life* and *death* are the direct opposites, one the effect of Adam's sin, the other of Christ's righteousness. And this death includes "the death of the body," according to his admission. Now, if we look back only a few lines we read, "Whatever effects flowed from Adam's sin or Christ's righteousness, flowed to infants, as such, in the first instance."—P. 636. Then if we look forward only a few lines we read, "Whatever, therefore, is the effect of Adam's sin upon our race, denoted by the term '*death*,' we find its sovereign anti-

dote and opposite in the effect of the grace of Christ."—P. 637. Again, "the injury done to our nature by the first transgression finds a sovereign and efficacious remedy through the second Adam."—P. 639.

Of course, no reasonable objection could be made to many, perhaps most of these statements, if the blessings contemplated were contingent and future. But the avowed design of the writer is to show that they are actually conferred upon our humanity at the very commencement of its being, and unconditionally continued through the period of infancy. He claims that this "justification" of our race through Christ "reverses the 'judgment' that stands against us at the first moment when it would otherwise take effect."—P. 638. Reverses the judgment! Part of that judgment, as Mr. Hibbard in effect admits, runs thus: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." And yet he says, "if the '*grace*,' the '*gift of righteousness*,' and '*life*,' do not annul the death sentence and restore to life, the argument [of Paul] means nothing." Mr. Hibbard seems to have felt the difficulty of his position—it is hardly possible that a mind so logical should not have felt it—and though at times unguarded, is usually careful to say spiritual death, spiritual life. But there is no rule of interpretation by which the apostle's language can be made to teach the actual and present reversal of the death penalty in one respect and not in the other.

It follows unavoidably from the teaching of these writers that, if Adam came into the world sinless, so do his descendants. If he was holy in the tendencies of his nature, "much more" are they. If he could maintain this holy estate to the end, so can they. If he was not liable to suffering and death, so neither are they. Whatever of excellence, physical, mental, or moral, was lost in Adam, was restored and "much more" than restored in Christ. No other construction, as it seems to us, can be put upon the language employed by these writers, and no other construction can be put upon the language of St. Paul, according to their theory of interpretation. Either the theory is wrong or the facts are wrong.

If, then, the doctrine of Infant Regeneration is to be found in the Scriptures, it must be sought elsewhere than in this argument of St. Paul, or any other Scriptures of the same class.

These Scriptures do indeed teach, that "they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." Yet this consummation of blessedness is not reached at once. The penitent believer, though "born again," is not at once sanctified. The sanctified Christian is still far from Adamic sinlessness. And the saint or the infant dying is not at once fully glorified. Notwithstanding the annulling of the death-sentence and restoration to life, death still reigns over the body, and shall continue to reign until "this mortal shall have put on immortality." Then, and then only, shall be fully achieved that wonderful triumph of grace contemplated in this fifth of Romans.

Indeed, though these advocates of this new doctrine are often borne along by the logical current upon which they have thrown themselves into statements which facts will by no means warrant, yet they evidently draw back from the conclusions to which their arguments inevitably lead. They certainly represent the effects of the atonement upon human nature as cotemporaneous and coextensive with the effects of the fall, as neutralizing those effects, restoring the life that was forfeited, and not only restoring the same blessings lost in Adam, but those blessings in greater measure than would have been enjoyed "had the first parents kept the first estate." Yet it is due to candor to admit that they do not intend to claim for the infant anything more than that initial change known as the new birth. Or rather, they claim a regenerate *state*, for *changed* it is not, the infant being in that state *ab initio*.

But, as already seen, the Scriptures do not warrant even this view, and facts, spiritual phenomena, are against it.

We have a right to inquire of the advocates of this doctrine what are the manifestations of this regenerate nature? For if infants are born again, we should expect to see some unmistakable indications of it. Even under the most unfavorable circumstances we should look for some signs of spiritual life, or at least some agonizing death-throes when that life is departing. Mr. Hibbard says, "An acorn has in it the life of the oak, but not in the same expansion and force. The natural child has the natural life of a man, but that life as yet performs not the functions, has not the force of adult age. Why may not children be subjects of grace, and of the principle of

spiritual life, while yet in an unconscious or non-developed age?"—P. 649.

And we press the question a little further, and ask why that spiritual life should not manifest itself, as the child develops, just as actively and unmistakably as the man-life in that same child, or as the oak-life of the acorn in its growth?

And it would seem, too, that under the influence of Christian training and example, and in the sanctuary of Christian homes, children should grow up Christians from their birth, Christlike in their tempers and tendencies. This, indeed, should be the *rule* of Christian experience; the Christian should "never know the hour when he was engrafted into Christ," but should be always conscious of the life of God in his soul.

And as in such cases there would be no sinful habits to be overcome, or in any way to embarrass spiritual growth, there should be comparatively little backsliding, little of those fearful and often fatal conflicts now so common, nay, universal in the Christian life.

But what are the facts in the case? Alas! what are they? Without one well-authenticated exception, every child born into the world, with the very first buddings of its moral nature gives unmistakable evidence of depravity, but none whatever of the victorious, superabounding spiritual life. All that parental love and Christian zeal the most enlightened can do to shield the little one from temptation, and to instill into the unfolding intellect and heart-feeling and principles of truth and holiness, all the ever-watchful care of guardian angels, and all the ever-present, ever-potent influences of the Holy Spirit, fail to develop into full grown Christian grace and excellence this germ of spiritual life. Day by day as character unfolds the sinful tendencies appear in greater strength, until, under the awakening influences of the Holy Ghost, the unhappy victim of hereditary depravity cries out in the anguish of his spirit, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Just at this juncture he hears a voice of compassion saying, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Or it may be a voice still more tender invites him, "Suffer the little children to come unto me." He hears, comes to Christ, and is a Christian.

What is now the experience of the young convert? Is it that of the backslider, of one who has merely recovered the lost grace of infancy? Such it most certainly should be if this theory be true. No. It is a new birth, a new creation. Old things have passed away, all things have become new. Henceforth this is set down as his spiritual birthday, the beginning of his spiritual life. Surely this is new, experienced just now for the first time. He was born in Egypt, and there until now he has groaned in bondage. But on this day, this day ever memorable in his history, with a strong hand the Lord has brought him out.

Conviction, repentance, faith, pardon and regeneration—this is the unvarying rule. These spiritual exercises may vary in intensity and duration in different individuals, but in their nature they are always the same. The conviction and repentance of the little one who has but just now begun to feel the force of moral responsibility, will of course differ from that of the old and hardened offender. He will see, by the light of God's Holy Spirit, that he is depraved, that many of his childish acts were really contrary to God's law, that from this moment he assumes the responsibility for that depravity and for those acts, and that from this moment he must bear the consequent guilt until he embraces Christ as his Saviour. His conviction is probably as pungent, his repentance as deep, his prayers as earnest, his faith as strong, and his subsequent joy as exultant, in proportion to his light and capability, as that of the convert of mature years. His conversion is just as distinctly marked.

The child convert may not always be able to tell the exact time when the work is wrought, and such is not unfrequently the case with those converted later in life. Yet with few if any exceptions, every Christian can give it with proximate accuracy, and can distinctly remember a time when he was not a Christian. But if one instance or a thousand instances could be found, in which the child yielded to the very earliest drawings of the Spirit, and was led imperceptibly into the path of peace—if the very first responsible act were an act of compliance with the Saviour's invitation, this would prove no exception to the rule, that regeneration is subsequent to generation, that spiritual birth is subsequent to natural birth.

Now, so far as we have the means of knowing, human depravity and not spiritual life is developed just as uniformly and just as naturally as the oak from the acorn. To all appearance, and without a single exception, a sinful life is but the spontaneous outgrowth, the simple unfolding of inherited depravity. With like uniformity, in every clearly defined case, the Christian life is never apparently developed from the germ of infant life, but is of later origin. Such uniformity in any department of vegetable or animal life, or in any other of the processes of nature, would create a philosophical necessity for ascribing them to the operation of *law.* And law it is in this case. St. Paul calls it "the law of sin," and shows just how it affects one whose conscience is thoroughly aroused.

If one would learn the amplitude and completeness of Gospel provisions, let him go to the fifth of Romans; but if he would witness the unfolding of man's moral nature under the teachings of truth and the striving of God's Spirit, let him go to the seventh. If the former is understood as describing man's birth-state, the effects of grace upon infant human nature, it meets no response from human experience; while universal human experience responds to the latter, as describing man's natural state.

It certainly cannot be denied, that the moral phenomena of life are against the doctrine in question. And in harmony with these teachings of facts are the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. They not only fail, or rather, refuse to sustain the doctrine, but assert directly the contrary. At present, however, we can consider only one passage, our Lord's interview with Nicodemus, John iii, 3–7.

Of the declarations made by our Lord in this interview we make these remarks:

I. These declarations are made to those capable of understanding and acting upon them. In their utmost comprehension they can embrace only beings whose "distinct entity or individuality is" already "established," who are already "human, possessed of a rational soul, and endued with the faculties of a moral being." No word could more certainly define this individuality than the pronoun, τις, in the third verse. And if the pronoun, ὑμᾶς, in the seventh verse does not

restrict our Lord's meaning to adults, it does unquestionably embrace in that meaning Nicodemus, to whom it was immediately addressed, and all others in like condition. And whenever the language assumes the form of direct address in any case, when our Lord says *to* any, "ye must be born again," he says it to those and those only who are personally responsible for their conduct.

II. These declarations are wholly prospective in their meaning; they look to a work yet future to the individual addressed. They come to the little one as he enters upon the responsibilities of probation, and solemnly yet tenderly admonish him of his true condition and great want, while Jesus says in his hearing, "Suffer the little children to come unto me." They follow him up through all his subsequent life, until he accepts the offer of salvation, or that offer is withdrawn. But at whatever period in the sinner's history these declarations are heard by him, they assure him that the great want of his being is yet unsupplied, the initial life which is to unfold into a glorious immortality has not yet been implanted in him. Still he is startled with the solemn truth that has been ringing in his ears ever since he became a responsible agent: "ye must be born again."

III. The work is spoken of as initial, as the beginning of spiritual life. If the word *γίνομαι* does not describe beginning, origin, then no word in any language can describe it. And had the Saviour intended to speak of recovery from a personal backsliding, a fall from the grace of infancy, or had he intended to urge the necessity of continuing in a regenerate state, he certainly could have found words to express either meaning, and not something quite different from either. When a human being enters upon life, we speak of it as a birth; but if some years afterward the child should die, and after a time be restored to life, we should not think of calling such restoration a *birth*, much less should we think of calling continued life by that name, and report a child born when we wanted to be understood that the child was now alive. No language could convey an impression more false. But it would not be more false than the meaning naturally conveyed by our Lord's words if his intention was to speak of either a regenerate *state* or the reclamation of a backslider. If the sinner of a hundred years

then first experiences this great moral change, it is a new birth; but if the child of ten regains a regenerate state which he had lost, again enters the path of peace from which he had departed, then some other word must describe the change. The result in both cases may be life, spiritual life; but in the former case the change is initial, original, while in the latter it is a reinstatement.

IV. Our Lord's assigned reason for the new birth conflicts with the doctrine of Infant Regeneration. The response of Nicodemus, in the fourth verse, evidently contemplates a return to infancy, with all that pertains to that period of helplessness and innocence. Can a man return to that state? This is obviously impossible, and the assertion of our Lord seemed to throw discredit on his teaching. Now, according to this doctrine, the answer was not merely irrelevant, but untrue. What is that answer? Substantially this. "True, Nicodemus, this is impossible. But if it were otherwise it would be of no avail; for the birth of which I speak is from above, spiritual, while that of which you speak is natural, according to the flesh. Now that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and flesh only, and consequently a return to human infancy could produce no moral change, could bring no spiritual life." Nicodemus was silenced though not satisfied. But if he had been a reader of the *Methodist Quarterly Review* in the year of grace 1859, he need not have been silenced so soon. He might have rejoined: "But, Rabbi, while I admit that natural and spiritual life do not flow from the same fountain, yet is it not true that they do meet in our humanity at its very origin? When natural life is transmitted from father to son, is not the spirit of God there, in pursuance of the provisions of the atonement, to repair 'the injury done to our nature by the first transgression,' and infuse spiritual life into that nature, so that every one born of the flesh is born of the Spirit also? And is not this spiritual life perpetuated unconditionally and in full force during the period of infancy, and will it not 'infallibly lift our humanity to heaven unless forfeited in maturer life?' Why, then would not a return to infancy, if that were possible, secure the very object contemplated?" Indeed, if the doctrine in question be true, our Lord could not have assigned as a reason for the *new* birth any lack connected with *natural* birth; for

whatever nature might lack grace supplied. Of course that lack could furnish no possible reason why Nicodemus or any one else "must be born again." Backsliding, the loss of the grace of infancy, might furnish such reason, but nothing dating back into that infancy. And it would seem, that, while in the first instance Nicodemus was misled through his own inexcusable ignorance of spiritual things, in the second instance he was misled intentionally, and by language that must of necessity convey a false impression. And, what is, if possible, still more remarkable, while the *mistake* was promptly corrected, and Nicodemus was taught that not a natural but spiritual birth was intended, the *falsehood* was left to mislead him and all that should come after him, to induce the belief that natural generation is not uniformly accompanied by spiritual regeneration—that to be "born of the flesh" does not necessarily involve being "born of the Spirit."

V. Our Lord's declarations substantially affirm, that some never are born again, and consequently never enter the kingdom of God. This point, if established, is of course fatal to the theory under examination. An attempt is made to avoid its force, by explaining the words of Christ as referring not so much to an *event*, in the new birth, as to a *state*, the regenerate state. The absurdity of this mode of explanation has been already exposed in part, but we wish to give it more special prominence. The natural and obvious meaning of the language, the meaning which it would convey to every one who has not a theory to care for, evidently is, that the new birth of which our Lord speaks is an event, an event dated and located as distinctly as natural birth, and forming as marked an epoch in one's history; that it is the initial change in which spiritual life originates, and that, to Nicodemus and others in like moral condition, it was an event yet future. It is true, language may sometimes be forced by its connections out of its natural and obvious meaning, but it so happens that this language is forced into that meaning. We are compelled to understand the Saviour as speaking of an actual occurrence, a change, of which a regenerate state and holy life are consequents; for, if that regenerate state were congenital, then, as already seen, a return to that state would secure it. But there can be no necessity for forcing an unnatural meaning upon

these weighty words of our Lord, unless the necessities of an erroneous theory require it. No, he means just what he says. Nicodemus, and all others in the same moral condition, "must be born again," not because they have fallen and lost their infant regeneration, but because they were never born of the Spirit, but only of the flesh.

VI. Finally, admitting the doctrine in question, nothing could be more shockingly absurd than our Lord's solemn asseveration, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." For according to that doctrine, every man is born again long before this declaration can reach his understanding.

The question now comes back, What is the moral condition of infants? And so far as the objects of the present discussion are concerned, this question may be answered in very few words. It is precisely the same as that of adult sinners, with one single exception. In the infant, depravity is incipient, germinal; in the adult, it is in progress of development. In their legal condition, however, there is an immeasurable difference.

N. B.—It is due to the author of the above article to say that it was written previous to the appearance of Dr. Hibbard's late work on "The Religion of Childhood."—Ed.

Art. III.—LEO THE GREAT AND THE PAPACY IN THE FIFTH AND SIXTH CENTURIES.*

The Roman bishop, it is well known, claims to unite in his person the fourfold dignity of bishop in his own diocese, metropolitan or archbishop in his province, patriarch of the West

* I. Sources: St. Leo Magnus: Opera omnia, (sermones et epistolæ,) ed. Paschas. Quesnel, Par., 1675, 2 vols. 4to., (Gallican, and defending Hilary against Leo, hence condemned by the Roman Index;) and ed. Petr. et Hieron., Ballerini, (two very learned brothers and presbyters, who wrote at the request of Pope Benedict XIV.) Venet. 1753–1757, 3 vols. fol. (Vol. i, contains ninety-six sermons and one hundred and seventy-three epistles, the other two volumes doubtful writings and learned dissertations.) This edition is reprinted in *Migne's* Patrologiæ Cursus completus, vol. liv–lvii, Par., 1846.

II. Works: Acta Sanctorum, sub Apr. 11, (Apr., tome ii, pp. 14–30, brief and unsatisfactory.) Tillemont: Mem., tome xv, pp. 414–832, (very full.) Butler:

or of the Latin Church, and pope of the universal Church, East and West, Greek and Latin. He claims to be the successor of Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the visible representative of Christ, who is the invisible head of the Christian world. This is the strict and exclusive sense of the title Pope.*

Properly speaking, this claim has never been fully realized, and remains to this day an apple of discord in the history of the Church. Greek Christendom has never acknowledged it, and Latin only under manifold protests, which at last conquered in the Reformation, and deprived the papacy forever of the best part of its domain. The fundamental fallacy of the Roman system is, that it identifies papacy and Church, and therefore, to be consistent, must unchurch not only Protestantism, but also the entire Oriental Church from its origin down. By the "una sancta catholica apostolica ecclesia" of the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed is to be understood the whole body of Catholic Christians, of which the *ecclesia Romana*, like the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, is only one of the most prominent branches. The idea of the papacy, and its claims to the universal dominion of the Church, were distinctly put forward, it is true, so early as the fifth century, but could not make themselves

Lives of the Saints, sub Apr. 11. W. A. Arendt (R. C.:) Leo der Grosse u. seine Zeit, Mainz, 1835, (Catholic Apologetic.) Edw. Perthel: P. Leo's I. Leben u. Lehren, Jena, 1843, (Protestant.) Fr. Böhringer: Die Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen, Zurich, 1846, vol. i, div. 4, pp. 170–309. Ph. Jaffe: Regesta Pontif. Rom., Berol., 1851, p. 34 sqq. Comp. also Greenwood: Cathedra Petri, Lond. 1859, vol. i, book ii, chap. iv–vi. (The Leonine Period;) and H. H. Milman: History of Latin Christianity, London and New York, 1860, vol. i, book ii, chap. iv.

* The name *papa*—according to some an abbreviation of *pater patrum*, but more probably, like the kindred *abbas*, πάππας, or πάπας, *pa-pa*, simply an imitation of the first prattling of children, thus equivalent to *father*—was in the West for a long time the honorary title of every bishop, as a spiritual father; but after the fifth century it became the special distinction of the patriarchs, and still later was assigned exclusively to the Roman bishop, and to him, in an eminent sense, as father of the whole Church. Comp. Du Cange, Glossar. s. verb. *papa* and *pater patrum;* and Hoffmann, Lexic. univers. iv, p. 561. In the same exclusive sense the Italian and Spanish *papa*, the French *pape*, the English *pope*, and the German *Papst* or *Pabst*, are used. In the Greek and Russian Churches, on the contrary, all priests are called *popes*—(from πάπας, *papa*.) The titles *apostolicus*, *vicarius Christi*, *summus pontifex*, *sedes apostolica*, were for a considerable time given to various bishops and their sees, but subsequently claimed exclusively by the bishops of Rome.

good beyond the limits of the West. Consequently the papacy, as a historical fact, or so far as it has been acknowledged, is properly nothing more than the Latin patriarchate run to absolute monarchy.

By its advocates the papacy is based not merely upon Church usage, like the metropolitan and patriarchal power, but upon divine right; upon the peculiar position which Christ assigned to Peter in the well-known words, "Thou art *Peter*, and on this *rock* will I build my Church."* This passage was at all times taken as an immovable exegetical rock for the papacy. The popes themselves appealed to it, times without number, as the great proof of the divine institution of a visible and infallible central authority in the Church. According to this view the primacy is before the apostolate, the head before the body, instead of the reverse.

But, in the first place, this pre-eminence of Peter did not in the least affect the independence of the other apostles. Paul especially, according to the clear testimony of his epistles and the book of Acts, stood entirely upon his own authority, and even on one occasion, at Antioch, took strong ground against Peter. Then, again, the personal position of Peter by no means yields the primacy to the Roman bishop without the twofold evidence, first that Peter was actually in Rome, and then that he transferred his prerogatives to the bishop of that city. The former fact rests upon a universal tradition of the early Church, which at that time no one doubted, but is in part weakened and neutralized by the absence of any clear Scripture evidence, and by the much more certain fact, given in the New Testament itself, that Paul labored in Rome, and that in no position of inferiority or subordination to any higher authority than that of Christ himself. The second assumption of the transfer of the primacy to the Roman bishops is susceptible of neither historical nor exegetical demonstration, and is merely an inference from the principle that the successor

* Matthew xvi, 18: Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ [mark the change of the gender from the masculine to the feminine, from the person to the thing or the truth confessed—a change which disappears in the English and German versions] οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς. Comp. the commentators, especially Meyer, Lange, Alford, Wordsworth, *ad l.*, and Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, §§ 90, 91, (New York edition, p. 350 sqq., and 374 sqq.)

in office inherits all the official prerogatives of his predecessor. But even granting both these intermediate links in the chain of the papal theory, the double question yet remains open: first, whether the Roman bishop be the only successor of Peter, or share this honor with the bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch, in which places also Peter confessedly resided; and secondly, whether the primacy involve at the same time a supremacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church, or be only an honorary primacy among patriarchs of equal authority and rank. The former was the Roman view, the latter was the Greek.

An African bishop, Cyprian, (258,) was the first to give to that passage of Matthew xvi, innocently, as it were, and with no suspicion of the future use and abuse of his view, a papistic interpretation, and to bring out clearly the idea of a perpetual *cathedra Patri*. The same Cyprian, however, whether consistently or not, was at the same time equally animated with the consciousness of episcopal equality and independence, afterward actually came out in bold opposition to Pope Stephen in a doctrinal controversy on the validity of heretical baptism, and persisted in this protest to his death.

The Church fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries in general agree in attaching to Peter a certain primacy over the other apostles, and in considering him the foundation of the Church in virtue of his confession of the divinity of Christ; while they hold Christ to be, in the highest sense, the divine ground and rock of the Church. And herein lies a solution of their apparent self-contradiction in referring the *petra* in Matthew xvi, 18, now to the person of Peter, now to his confessor, now to Christ. Then, as the bishops in general were regarded as successors of the apostles, the fathers saw in the Roman bishops, on the ground of the ancient tradition of the martyrdom of Peter in Rome, the successor of Peter and the heir of the primacy. But respecting the nature and prerogatives of this primacy their views were very indefinite and various. It is remarkable that the reference of the *rock* to *Christ*, which Augustine especially defended with great earnestness, was acknowledged even by the greatest pope of the middle ages, Gregory VII., in the famous inscription he sent with a crown to the Emperor Rudolph: "*Petra* [that is, Christ] *dedit*

Petro, [that is, to the apostle;] *Petrus* [the pope] *diadema Rudolpho*."*

It is worthy of notice that the post-Nicene, as well as the ante-Nicene fathers, with all their reverence for the Roman see, regarded the heathenish title of Rome, *urbs æterna*, as blasphemous, with reference to the passage of the woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, Rev. xvii, 3.† The prevailing opinion seems to have been, that Rome and the Roman empire would fall before the advent of Antichrist and the second coming of the Lord.‡

We have no room here to trace out in detail the opinions of the Latin and Greek fathers, and the ancient synodical legislation on this subject, and come to the position of the early popes themselves.

In most of the earlier bishops of Rome the person is eclipsed by the office. The spirit of the age and public opinion rule the bishops, not the bishops them. Victor, in the Easter controversy of the second century, Callistus, in that on the restoration of the lapsed, and Stephen, in that on heretical baptism at the time of Cyprian, were the first Roman bishops who came out with hierarchical arrogance; but they were somewhat premature, and found vigorous resistance in Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Cyprian, though on all these questions the Roman view at last carried the day. At the close of the fourth century Damasus, who established the authority of the Latin Vulgate, and Siricuis, who issued the first genuine decretal letter, trod in the steps of those predecessors. Innocent I. (402–417) took a step beyond, and in the Pelagian controversy ventured the bold assertion, that in the whole Christian world nothing should be decided without the cognizance of the Roman see, and that, especially in matters of faith, all bishops must turn to St. Peter.§

* Baronius, Annal. ad ann. 1080, vol. xi, p. 704.

† Hieronymus, Adv. Jovin., lib. ii, chap. 38, (Opera, tome ii, p. 382,) where he addresses Rome: "Ad te loquar, quæ scriptam in fronte blasphemiam Christi confessione delesti." Prosper: "Æterna cum dicitur quæ temporalis est, utique nomen est blasphemiæ." Comp. Piper, l. c. p. 46.

‡ So Chrysostum, ad 2 Thess. ii, 7; Hieronymus, Ep. cxxi, qu. 11, (tome i, p. 880 sq.;) Augustine, De civit. Dei, lib. xx, cap. 19.

§ Ep. ad Conc. Carthag., and Ep. ad Concil. Milev., both in 416. In reference to this decision, which went against Pelagius, Augustine uttered the word so often quoted by Roman divines: "*Causa finita est*, utinam aliquando finiatur error."

But the first pope, in the proper sense of the word, is LEO I., who justly bears the title of "THE GREAT" in the history of the Latin hierarchy. In him the idea of the papacy, as it were, became flesh and blood. He conceived it in great energy and clearness, and carried it out with the Roman spirit of dominion, so far as the circumstances of the time at all allowed. He marks the same relative epoch in the development of the papacy as Cyprian in the history of the episcopate. He had even a higher idea of the prerogatives of the see of Rome than Gregory the Great, who, though he reigned a hundred and fifty years later, represents rather the patriarchal idea than the papal. Leo was at the same time the first important theologian in the chair of Rome, surpassing in acuteness and depth of thought all his predecessors, and all his successors down to Gregory I. Benedict XIV. placed him (A. D. 1744) in the small class of *doctores ecclesiæ*, or authoritative teachers of the Catholic faith. He battled with the Manichean, the Priscillianist, the Pelagian, and other heresies, and won an immortal name as the finisher of the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ.

The time and place of the birth and earlier life of Leo are unknown. His letters, which are the chief source of information, commence not before the year 442. Probably a Roman,* if not one by birth, he was virtually a Roman in the proud dignity of his spirit and bearing, the high order of his legislative and administrative talent, and the strength and energy of his will. He distinguished himself, first under Cœlestine (423–432) and Sextus III., (432–440,) as archdeacon and legate of the Roman Church. After the death of the latter, and while himself absent in Gaul, he was elected pope by the united

But when Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, took the part of Pelagius, Augustine and the African Church boldly opposed him, and made use of the Cyprianic right of protest. "Circumstances alter cases."

* As Quesnel and most of his successors infer from Prosper's Chronicles, and a passage in Leo's Ep. xxxi, chap. 4, where he assigns among the reasons for not attending the council at Ephesus in 449, that he could not "deserere *patriam* et sedem apostoliram." *Patria*, however, may as well mean Italy, or at least the diocese of Rome, including the ten suburban provinces. In the Liber pontificalis he is called "Natione *Tuscus*," but in two manuscript copies "Natione *Romanus*." Canisius in the Acta Sanctorum adopts the former view. Butler reconciles the difficulty by supposing that he was descended of a noble Tuscan family, but born at Rome.

voice of clergy, senate, and people, and continued in that office one and twenty years, (440–461.) His feelings at the assumption of this high office he himself thus describes in one of his sermons: "Lord, I have heard your voice calling me, and I was afraid: I considered the work which was enjoined on me, and I trembled. For what proportion is there between the burden assigned to me and my weakness, this elevation and my nothingness. What is more to be feared than exaltation without merit, the exercise of the most holy functions being intrusted to one who is buried in sin. O you have laid upon me this heavy burden, bear it with me, I beseech you; be you my guide and my support."

During the time of his pontificate he was almost the only great man in the Roman empire, developed extraordinary activity, and took a leading part in all the affairs of the Church. His private life is entirely unknown, and we have no reason to question the purity of his motives or of his morals. His official zeal and all his time and strength were devoted to the interests of Christianity. But with him the interests of Christianity were identical with the universal dominion of the Roman Church.

He was animated with the unwavering conviction that the Lord himself had committed to him, as the successor of Peter, the care of the entire Church.* He anticipated all the dogmatical arguments by which the power of the papacy was subsequently established. He refers the *petra*, on which the Church is built, to Peter and his confession. Though Christ himself, to sum up his view on the subject, is in the highest sense the rock and foundation, beside which no other can be laid; yet, by transfer of his authority, the Lord made Peter the rock in virtue of his great confession, and built on him the indestructible temple of his Church. In Peter the fundamental relation of Christ to his Church comes, as it were, to concrete form and reality in history. To him specially and

* Ep. v, ad Episcopos Metrop. per Illyricum constitutos tomo ii, (ed. Ball. I, 617, in Migne's Patristic Libr., vol. i–iv, p. 515,) Quia per *omnes* ecclesias cura nostra distenditur, *exigente* hoc a nobis *Domino*, qui apostolicæ dignitatis beatissimo apostolo Petro primatum fidei suæ remuneratione *commisit*, *universalem* ecclesiam in fundamenti ipsius [Quesnel proposes *istius* for *ipsius*] soliditate constituens, necessitatem sollicitudinis quam habemus, cum his qui nobis collegii caritate juncti sunt, sociamus."

individually the Lord intrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven; to the other apostles only in their general and corporate capacity. For the faith of Peter the Lord specially prayed in the hour of his passion, as if the standing of the other apostles would be the firmer if the mind of their leader remained unconquered. On Peter rests the steadfastness of the whole apostolic college in the faith. To him the Lord, after his resurrection, committed the care of his sheep and lambs. Peter is therefore the pastor and prince of the whole Church, through whom Christ exercises his universal dominion on earth. This primacy, however, is not limited to the apostolic age, but, like the faith of Peter, and like the Church herself, it perpetuates itself; and it perpetuates itself through the bishops of Rome, who are related to Peter as Peter was related to Christ. As Christ in Peter, so Peter in his successors lives and speaks and perpetually executes the commission, "Feed my sheep." It was by special direction of Divine Providence that Peter labored and died in Rome, and sleeps with thousands of blessed martyrs in holy ground. The center of worldly empire alone can be the center of the kingdom of God. Yet the political position of Rome would be of no importance without the religious considerations. By Peter was Rome, which had been the center of all error and superstition, transformed into the metropolis of the Christian world, and invested with a spiritual dominion far wider than her former earthly empire. Hence the bishopric of Constantinople, not being a *sedes apostolica*, but resting its dignity on a political basis alone, can never rival the Roman, whose primacy is rooted both in divine and human right. Antioch also, where Peter only transiently resided, and Alexandria, where he planted the Church through his disciple Mark, stand only in a secondary relation to Rome, where his bones repose, and where that was completed which in the East was only laid out. The Roman bishop is, therefore, the *primus omnium episcoporum pastorum*, and on him devolves the *plenitudo potestatis*, the *solicitudo omnium pastorum*, and *communis cura universalis ecclesiæ*.*

* These views Leo repeatedly expresses in his sermons on the festival of St. Peter, and on the anniversary of his own elevation, as well as in his official letters to the African, Illyrian, and South Gallic bishops, to Dioscurus of Alexandria, to the Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, to the Emperor Marcian, and

Leo thus made out of a primacy of grace and of personal fitness a primacy of right and of succession. Of his person, indeed, he speaks in his sermons with great humility, but only thereby the more to exalt his official character. He tells the Romans that the true celebration of the anniversary of his accession is, to recognize, honor, and obey, in his lowly person, Peter himself, who still cares for shepherd and flock, and whose dignity is not lacking even to his unworthy heir.* Here, therefore, we already have that characteristic combination of humility and arrogance which has stereotyped itself in the expressions, "Servant of the servant of God," "Vicar of Christ," and even "God upon earth." In this double consciousness of his personal unworthiness and his official exaltation, Leo annually celebrated the day of his elevation to the chair of Peter. While Peter himself passes over his prerogative in silence, and expressly warns against hierarchical assumption,† Leo cannot speak frequently and emphatically enough of his authority. While Peter in Antioch meekly submits to the rebuke of the junior apostle Paul,‡ Leo pronounces resistance to his authority to be impious pride and the sure way to hell.§ Obedience to the pope is thus necessary to salvation. Whosoever says he is not with the apostolic see, that is, with the head of the body, whence all gifts of grace descend throughout the body, is not in the body of the Church, and has no part in her grace. This is the fearful but legitimate logic of the papal principle, which confines the kingdom of God to the narrow lines of a particular organization, and makes the universal spiritual reign of Christ dependent on a temporal form and a human organ. But in its very first application this papal ban proved itself a *brutum fulmen*, when, in

the Empress Pulcheria. Particular proof passages are unnecessary. Comp. especially Ep. x, xi, civ, cvi, (ed. Baller.,) and Perthel, l. c. pp. 226–241, where the chief passages are given in full.

* "Cujus dignitas etiam in indigno hærede non deficit." Sermo iii, in Natal. ordin. c. 4, (vol. i, p. 13, ed. Ball.) "Etsi necessarium est trepidare de meritis, religiosum est tamen gaudere de dono: quoniam qui mihi oneris est auctor, ipse est administrationis adjutor." Sermon ii, c. i.

† 1 Pet. v, 3. ‡ Galatians ii, 11.

§ Ep. x, c. ii, (ed. Ball. i, p. 634; ed. Migne, vol. liv, p. 630,) to the Gallican bishops in the matter of Hilary: "Cui (so Petro) quisquis principatum [illegible] denegandum, illius quidem nullo modo potest minuere dignitatem; sed [illegible] *spiritu superbiæ suæ semetipsum in inferna demergit.*" Comp. Ep. clxiv, 3; clvi, 3.

spite of it, the Gallican Archbishop Hilary, against whom it was directed, died universally esteemed and loved, and then was canonized. This very impracticability of that principle which would exclude all Greek and Protestant Christians from the kingdom of heaven, is a refutation of the principle itself.

In carrying his idea of the papacy into effect Leo displayed the cunning tact, the diplomatic address, and the iron consistency which characterize the greatest popes of the middle age. The circumstances in general were in his favor: the East rent by dogmatic controversies; Africa devastated by the barbarians; the West weak in a weak emperor; nowhere a powerful and pure bishop or divine, like Athanasius, Augustine, or Jerome in the former generation; the overthrow of the western empire at hand; a new age breaking, with new peoples, for whose childhood the papacy was just the needful school; the most numerous and the last important general council convened; and the system of ecumenical orthodoxy ready to be closed with the decision concerning the relation of the two natures in Christ.

Leo first took advantage of the distractions of the North African Church under the Arian Vandals, and wrote to its bishops in the tone of an acknowledged over-shepherd. Under the stress of the times, and in the absence of a towering character like Cyprian and Augustine, the Africans submitted to his authority, (443.) He banished the remnants of the Manicheans and Pelagians from Italy, and threatened the bishops with his anger if they should not purge their Churches of the heresy. In East Illyria, which was important to Rome as the ecclesiastical outpost toward Constantinople, he succeeded in regaining and establishing the supremacy which had been acquired by Damasus, but had afterward slipped away. Anastasius of Thessalonica applied to him to be confirmed in his office. Leo granted the prayer in 444, extending the jurisdiction of Anastasius over all the Illyrian bishops, but reserving to them a right of appeal in important cases, which ought to be decided by the pope according to divine revelation. And a case to his purpose soon presented itself, in which Leo brought his vicar to feel that he was called indeed to a participation of his care, but not to a plenitude of power, (*plenitudo protestatis.*) In the affairs of the Spanish Church, also, Leo had an

opportunity to make his influence felt, when Turibius, Bishop of Astorga, besought his intervention against the Priscillianists. He refuted those heretics point by point, and on the basis of his exposition the Spaniards drew up an orthodox *regula fidei* with eighteen anathemas against the Priscillianist error.

But in Gaul he met with a strenuous antagonist in Archbishop Hilary of Arles, an energetic and unyielding representative of Gallican independence from Romish interference; and though he called the secular power to his aid, and procured from the Emperor Valentinian an edict entirely favorable to his claims, he attained but a partial victory. Hilary never submitted to Rome, died in the possession of his metropolitan power, and was canonized as a saint alongside with his papal antagonist, who had cut him off from the communion of the Church of Rome. Still less successful was his effort to establish his primacy in the East, and to prevent his rival at Constantinople from being elevated, by the famous twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon, to official equality with himself. His earnest protest against that decree produced no lasting effect. But otherwise he had the most powerful influence in the second stage of the christological controversy. He neutralized the tyranny of Dioscurus of Alexandria, and the results of the shameful robber-council of Ephesus (449) furnished the chief occasion of the fourth ecumenical council, presided over it by his legates, (which the Roman bishop had done at neither of the three councils before,) and gave the turn to the final solution of its doctrinal problem by that celebrated letter to Flavian of Constantinople, the main points of which were incorporated in the new symbol. Yet he owed this influence by no means to his office alone, but most of all to his deep insight of the question, and to the masterly tact with which he held the Catholic orthodox mean between the Alexandrian and Antiochian, Eutychian and Nestorian extremes. The particulars of his connection with this important dogma belong, however, to the history of doctrine.

Besides thus shaping the polity and doctrine of the Church, Leo did immortal service to the city of Rome in twice rescuing it from destruction.* When Attila, king of the Huns, the "scourge of God," after destroying Aquileia, was seriously

* Comp. Perthel, l. c. p. 90 sqq., and p. 104 sqq.

threatening the capital of the world, (A.D. 452,) Leo, with only two companions, crozier in hand, trusting in the help of God, ventured into the hostile camp, and by his venerable form, his remonstrances, and his gifts, changed the wild heathen's purpose. The later legend, which Raphael's pencil has employed, adorned the fact with a visible appearance of Peter and Paul, accompanying the bishop with drawn sword, and threatening Attila with destruction unless he should desist.* A similar case occurred several years after, (455,) when the Vandal king, Genseric, invited out of revenge by the Empress Eudoxia, pushed his ravages to Rome. Leo obtained from him the promise that at least he would spare the city the inflictions of murder and fire; but the barbarians subjected it to a fourteen days' pillage, the enormous spoils of which they transported to Carthage; and afterward the pope did everything to alleviate the consequent destitution and suffering, and to restore the churches.† Leo died in 461, and was buried in the Church of St. Peter. The day and circumstances of his death are unknown.‡

The literary works of Leo consist of ninety-six sermons and one hundred and seventy-three epistles, including epistles of others to him. They are earnest, forcible, full of thought, churchly, abounding in bold antitheses and allegorical freaks of exegesis, and sometimes heavy, turgid, and obscure in style. His collection of sermons is the first we have from a Roman bishop. In his inaugural discourse he declared preaching to be his sacred duty. The sermons are short and simple, and were delivered mostly on high festivals and on the anniversaries of his own elevation.§ Other works ascribed to him, such

* Leo himself says nothing of his mission to Attila. Prosper, in Chronicles ad ann. 452, mentions it briefly and Canisius, in Vita Leonis, (in Acta Sanctorum, for the month of April tome ii, p. 18,) with later exaggerations.

† Comp. Leo's eighty-fourth sermon, which was preached soon after the departure of the Vandals, and Prosper, Chronicles ad ann. 455.

‡ The Roman Calendar places his name on the 11th of April. But different writers fix his death on June 28, Oct. 30, (Quesnel,) Nov. 4, (Pagi,) Nov. 10, (Butler.) Butler quotes the concession of Bower, the apostate Jesuit, who in his Lives of the Popes says of Leo that "he was without doubt a man of extraordinary parts, far superior to all who had governed that Church before him, and scarce equaled by any since."

§ Sermones de natali. Canisius (in Acta Sanctorum, l. c., p. 17) calls Leo "Christianum Demosthenem."

as that on the calling of all nations,* which takes a middle ground on the doctrine of predestination, with the view to reconcile the Semi-pelagians and Augustinians, are of doubtful genuineness.

The first Leo and the first Gregory are the two greatest bishops of Rome in the first six centuries. Between them no important personage appears on the chair of Peter; and in the course of that intervening century the idea and the power of the papacy make no material advance. In truth, they went further in Leo's mind than they did in Gregory's. Leo thought and acted as an absolute monarch; Gregory as first among the patriarchs; yet both under the full conviction that they were the successors of Peter.

After the death of Leo, the Archdeacon Hilary, who had represented him at the Council of Ephesus, was elected to his place, and ruled (461–468) upon his principles, asserting the strict orthodoxy in the East and the authority of the primacy in Gaul.

His successor, Simplicius, (468–483,) saw the final dissolution of the empire under Romulus Augustulus, (476,) but, as he takes not the slightest notice of it in his epistles, he seems to have ascribed to it but little importance. The papal power had been rather favored than hindered in its growth by the imbecility of the latest emperors. Now, to a certain extent, it stepped into the imperial vacancy, and the successor of Peter became, in the mind of the western nations, sole heir of the old Roman imperial succession.

On the fall of the empire the pope became the political subject of the barbarian and heretical (for they were Arian) kings; but these princes, as most of the heathen emperors had done, allowed him, either from policy, or from ignorance or indifference, entire freedom in ecclesiastical affairs. In Italy the Catholics had by far the ascendency in numbers and in culture, and the Arianism of the new rulers was rather an outward profession than an inward conviction. Odoacer, who

* De Vocatione Omnium Gentium, a work highly praised even by Erasmus, Luther, Bullinger, and Grotius. Quesnel has only proved the possibility of Leo's being the author. (Comp. Perthel, l. c., p. 127 sqq.) The Sacramentarium Leonis, or a collection of liturgical prayers for all the festival days of the year, contains some of his prayers, but also many which are of a later date.

first assumed the kingdom of Italy, (476–493,) was tolerant toward the orthodox faith, yet attempted to control the papal election in 483 in the interest of the state, and prohibited, under penalty of the anathema, the alienation of church property by any bishop. Twenty years later a Roman council protested against this intervention of a layman, and pronounced the above prohibition null and void, but at the same time passed a similar decree against the alienation of church estate.*

Pope Felix II., or, according to another reckoning, III., (483–492,) continued the war of his predecessor against the Monophysitism of the East, rejected the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno as an unwarrantable intrusion of a layman in matters of faith, and ventured even the excommunication of the Bishop Acacius of Constantinople. Acacius replied with a counter anathema, with the support of the other eastern patriarchs; and the schism between the two Churches lasted over thirty years, to the pontificate of Hormisdas.

Gelasius I. (492–496) clearly announced the principle that the priestly power is above the kingly and the imperial, and that from the decisions of the chair of Peter there is no appeal. Yet from this pope we have, on the other hand, a remarkable testimony against what he pronounces the "sacrilege" of withholding the cup from the laity, the *communio sub una specie.*

Anastasius II. (496–498) indulged in a milder tone toward Constantinople, and incurred the suspicion of consent to its heresy.† His sudden death was followed by a contested papal election, which led to bloody encounters. The Ostrogothic king Theodoric, (the Dietrich of Bern in the *Nibelungenlied*,) the conqueror and master of Italy, (493–526,) and, like Odoacer, an Arian, was called into consultation in this contest, and gave his voice for Symmachus against Laurentius, because Symmachus had received the majority of votes, and had been consecrated first. But the party of Laurentius, not satisfied with this, raised against Symmachus the reproach of gross iniquities, even of adultery and of squandering the Church estates. The bloody scenes were renewed, priests were murdered, cloi-

* This was the fifth (al. fourth) council under Symmachus, held in November, 502, therefore later than the *synodus palmaris*. (Comp. Hefele, ii, p. 625 sqq.)

† Dante puts him in hell, and Baronius ascribes his sudden death to an evident judgment of God.

ters were burned, and nuns were insulted. Theodoric being again called upon by the senate for a decision, summoned a council at Rome, to which Symmachus gave his consent; and a synod, convoked by a heretical king, must decide upon the pope! In the course of the controversy several councils were held in rapid succession, the chronology of which is disputed.* The most important was the *synodus palmaris*,† the fourth council under Symmachus, held in October, 501. It acquitted this pope without investigation, on the presumption that it did not behoove the council to pass judgment respecting the successor of St. Peter. In his vindication of this council—for the opposition was not satisfied with it—the deacon Ennodius, afterward Bishop of Pavia, (521,) gave the first clear expression to the absolution which Leo had already acted: that the Roman bishop is above every human tribunal, and is responsible only to God himself.‡ Nevertheless, even in the middle age, popes were deposed and set up by emperors and general councils. This is one of the points of dispute between the absolute papal system and the constitutional episcopal system in the Roman Church, which was left unsettled even by the Council of Trent.

Under Hormisdas (514–523) the Monophysite party in the Greek Church was destroyed by the energetic zeal of the orthodox Emperor Justin, and in 519 the union of that Church with Rome was restored after a schism of five and thirty years.

Theodoric offered no hinderance to the transactions and embassies, and allowed his most distinguished subject to assert his ecclesiastical supremacy over Constantinople. This semi-barbarous and heretical prince was tolerant in general, and very liberal toward the Catholic Church; even rising to the principle which has waited till the modern age for its recognition, that the power of the prince should be restricted to civil government, and should permit no trespass on the con-

* Comp. Hefele, ii, p. 615 sqq.

† So named from the building in Rome in which it was held: "A portico beati Petri Apostoli, quæ apellatur ad Palmaria," as Anastasius says. In the histories of councils it is erroneously given as Synodus III. Many historians, Giesler among them, place it in the year 503.

‡ Libellus apologeticus pro Synodo IV. Romana, in Mansi VIII., 274. This vindication was solemnly adopted by the sixth Roman council under Symmachus, in 503, and made equivalent to a decree of council.

science of its subjects. No one, says he, shall be forced to believe against his will. Yet, toward the close of his reign, on mere political suspicion, he ordered the execution of the celebrated philosopher Boethius, with whom the old Roman literature far more worthily closes than the Roman empire with Augustulus; and on the same ground he caused the death of the senator Symmachus and the incarceration of Pope John I., (523–526.)

Almost the last act of his reign was the nomination of the worthy *Felix III.* (IV.) to the papal chair after a protracted struggle of contending parties. With the appointment he issued the order that hereafter, as heretofore, the pope should be elected by clergy and people, but should be confirmed by the temporal prince before assuming his office; and with this understanding the clergy and the city gave their consent to the nomination.

Yet, in spite of this arrangement, in the election of Boniface II. (530–532) and John II. (532–535) the same disgraceful quarreling and briberies occurred; a sort of chronic disease in the history of the papacy.

Soon after the death of Theodoric (526) the Gothic empire fell to pieces through internal distraction and imperial weakness. Italy was conquered by Belisarius, (535,) and, with Africa, again incorporated with the East-Roman empire, which renewed under Justinian its ancient splendor, and enjoyed a transient after-summer. And yet this powerful orthodox emperor was a slave to the intriguing, heretical Theodora, whom he had raised from the theater to the throne; and Belisarius likewise, his victorious general, was completely under the power of his wife Antonina.

With the conquest of Italy the popes fell into a perilous and unworthy dependence on the emperor at Constantinople, who reverenced, indeed, the Roman chair, but not less that of Constantinople, and in reality sought to use both as tools of his own State-Church despotism. Agapetus (535–536) offered fearless resistance to the arbitrary course of Justinian, and successfully protested against the elevation of the Eutychian Anthimus to the patriarchal see of Constantinople. But, by the intrigues of the Monophysite empress, his successor, Pope

Silverius, (a son of Hormisdas, 536–538,) was deposed on the charge of treasonable correspondence with the Goths, and banished to the island of Pandataria, whither the worst heathen emperors used to send the victims of their tyranny, and where, in 540, he died, whether a natural or a violent death we do not know.

Vigilius, a pliant creature of Theodora, ascended the papal chair under the military protection of Belisarius, (538–554.) The empress had promised him this office and a sum of money on condition that he nullify the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and pronounce Anthimus and his friends orthodox. The ambitious and double-tongued prelate accepted the condition and accomplished the deposition, and, perhaps, the death of Silverius. In his pontificate occurred the violent controversy of the three chapters and the second general Council of Constantinople, (553.) His administration was an unprincipled vacillation between the dignity and duties of his office and subservience to an alien theological and political influence; between repeated condemnation of the three chapters in behalf of a Eutychianizing spirit and repeated retraction of that condemnation. In Constantinople, where he resided several years at the instance of the emperor, he suffered much personal persecution, but without the spirit of martyrdom, and without its glory. For example, at least according to western accounts, he was violently torn from the altar upon which he was holding with both hands so firmly that the posts of the canopy fell in above him; he was dragged through the streets with a rope round his neck and cast into a common prison because he would not submit to the will of Justinian and his council. Yet he yielded at last, through fear of deposition. He obtained permission to return to Rome, but died in Sicily of the stone on his way thither, (554.)

Pelagius I., (554–560,) by order of Justinian, whose favor he had previously gained as papal legate at Constantinople, was made successor of Vigilius, but found only two bishops ready to consecrate him. His close connection with the East, and his approval of the fifth ecumenical council, which was regarded as a partial concession to the Eutychian christology, and, so far, an impeachment of the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, alienated many western bishops even in Italy, and

induced a temporary suspension of their connection with Rome. He issued a letter to the whole Christian world, in which he declared his entire agreement with the first four general councils, and then vindicated the fifth as in no way departing from the Chalcedonian dogma. But only by the military aid of Narses could he secure subjection; and the most refractory bishops, those of Aquileia and Milan, he sent as prisoners to Constantinople.

In these two Justinian-made popes we see how much the power of the Roman hierarchy was indebted to its remoteness from the Byzantine despotism, and how much it was injured by contact with it.

With the descent of the Arian Longobards into Italy, after 568, the popes again became more independent of the Byzantine court. They continued under tribute indeed to the exarchs in Ravenna, as the representatives of the Greek emperors, (from 554,) and were obliged to have their election confirmed and their inauguration superintended by them. But the feeble hold of these officials in Italy, and the pressure of the Arian barbarians upon them, greatly favored the popes, who, being the richest proprietors, enjoyed also great political consideration in Italy, and applied their influence to the maintenance of law and order amid the reigning confusion.

In other respects the administrations of John III., (560–573,) Benedict I., (574–578,) and Pelagius II., (578–590,) are among the darkest and the most sterile in the annals of the papacy.

But with GREGORY I. (590–604) a new period begins. Next to Leo I. he was the greatest of the ancient bishops of Rome, and he marks the transition of the patriarchal system into the strict papacy of the middle ages. He comes, it is true, with more modest claims than Leo, who surpassed him in boldness, energy, and consistency. He even solemnly protested, as his predecessor Pelagius II. had done, against the title of *universal* bishop, which the Constantinopolitan patriarch, John Jejunator, adopted at a council in 587;* and he declared it an *antichristian* assumption, in terms which quite remind us of the

* Even Justinian repeatedly applied to the patriarch of Constantinople officially the title οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης, *universalis patriarcha*.

patriarchal equality, and seem to form a step in recession from the ground of Leo. But when we take his operations in general into view, and remember the rigid consistency of the papacy, which never forgets, we are almost justified in thinking that this protest was directed not so much against the title itself as against the bearer of it, and proceeded more from jealousy of a rival at Constantinople than from sincere humility.* From the same motive the Roman bishops avoided the title of *patriarch*, as placing them on a level with the eastern patriarchs, and preferred the title of *pope*, from a sense of the specific dignity of the chair of Peter. Gregory is said to have been the first to use the humble-proud title, "Servant of the servants of God," (*servus servorum Dei*,) which ill agrees with the claims of the vicar of Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, and the representative of God almighty on earth! His successors, notwithstanding his remarkable protest, called themselves freely the "universal bishops of Christendom." What he had condemned in his oriental colleagues as antichristian arrogance, the latter popes considered but the appropriate expression of their official position in the Church universal.

It is not our object to pursue the development of the papacy any further through its varying fortunes, misfortunes, conflicts, and triumphs during the middle ages; its split, decline, and terrible ordeal during the Reformation; its subsequent revival during the Indian summer of Jesuitical restoration; its present crisis and prospects. We will only offer, in conclusion, a few general reflections from a purely historical point of observation.

The papacy is undeniably the result of a long process of

* Bellarmine disposes of this apparent testimony of one of the great and best popes against the system of popery which has frequently been urged since Calvin by Protestant controversialists, by assuming that the term *episcopus universalis* is used in two very different senses. "Respondeo," he says in his great controversial work, *De Controversiis Christianæ Fidei, etc., de Romano Pontifice*, lib. ii, cap. 31,) duobus modis posse intelligi nomen universalis episcopi. Uno modo, ut ille, qui dicitur universalis, intelligatur esse solus episcopus omnium urbium Christianarum, ita ut cæteri non sint episcopi, sed vicarii tantum illius, qui dicitur episcopus universalis, et hoc modo nomen hoc est vere profanum, sacrilegum et antichristianum. . . . Altero modo dici potest episcopus universalis, qui habet curam totius ecclesiæ, sed generalem, ita ut non excludat particulares episcopos. Et hoc modo nomen hoc posse tribui Romano pontifici ex mente Gregorii probatur."

history. Centuries were employed in building it, and centuries have already been engaged upon its partial destruction. Lust of honor and of power, and even open fraud,* have contributed to its development; for human nature lies hidden under episcopal robes, with its steadfast inclination to abuse the power intrusted to it; and the greater the power, the stronger is the temptation and the worse the abuse. But behind and above these human impulses lay the needs of the Church and the plans of Providence, and these are the proper basis for explaining the rise, as well as the subsequent decay, of the papal dominion over the countries and nations of Europe.

That Providence which moves the helm of the history of the world and Church, according to an eternal plan, not only prepares in silence and a secrecy unknown even to themselves the suitable persons for a given work, but also lays in the depths of the past the foundations of mighty institutions, that they may appear thoroughly furnished as soon as the time may demand them. Thus the origin and gradual growth of the Latin patriarchate at Rome looked forward to the middle age, and formed part of the necessary external outfit of the Church for her disciplinary mission among the heathen barbarians. The vigorous hordes who destroyed the West-Roman empire were to be themselves built upon the ruins of the old civilization, and trained by an awe-inspiring ecclesiastical authority and a firm hierarchical organization to Christianity and freedom, till, having come of age, they should need the legal schoolmaster no longer, and should cast away his cords from them. The Catholic hierarchy, with its pyramid-like culmination in the papacy, served among the Romanic and Germanic peoples, until the time of the Reformation, a purpose similar to that of the Jewish theocracy and the old Roman empire respectively in the inward and outward preparation for Christianity. The full exhibition of this pedagogic purpose belongs to the history of the middle age; but the foundation for it we

* Recall the interpolations of papistic passages in the works of Cyprian; the Roman enlargement of the sixth canon of Nice; the citation of the Sardican canon under the name and authority of the Nicene council; and the latter notorious pseudo-Isidorian decretals. The popes, to be sure, were not the original authors of these falsifications, but they used them freely and repeatedly for their purposes.

find already being laid in the Nicene and post-Nicene age, especially in the reign of that most remarkable man who is the prominent figure in this article.

But the very reason we have assigned for the historical or temporal (not divine or eternal) right and necessity of the papacy is the best reason for its downfall, and instead of weakening the cause of Protestantism, gives it a powerful weapon in its controversy with Rome. Admitting that Romanism and popery were a wholesome school of discipline for the nations of the dark ages, we connect it inseparably with a lower stage of Christianity and civilization, and place its main power and significance in the past. To say that it *has had* its right, its necessity, its glory, is to say that it has it *no more*. The law of Moses was a schoolmaster to lead the Jewish nation to Christ, and looked to the Gospel as its fulfillment. The types and shadows of the Old Testament passed away when the substance appeared: the Jewish Sabbath was lost in the Christian Sunday, circumcision in baptism for the remission of sins, the passover in the holy communion, the daily sacrifice in the one eternal sacrifice of the cross. The whole Jewish religion was a religion of hope and of the future, constantly pointing beyond itself and finding its inmost sense and meaning in the Christian dispensation.

Then, again, every system of discipline looks toward manly self-government and independence. The mother cares and provides for her children, not to keep them in a helpless minority, but with a view to train them up to youth and independent manhood and womanhood. So the whole medieval Catholicism was a training school for evangelical freedom in Christ. Hence it is as impossible to turn Protestantism back into the swaddling clothes of medieval Romanism, as to change a grown man into an infant, or to turn the stream back to its fountain.

But here lies also the great difference between the Greek Catholic and the Evangelical Protestant opposition to the universal monarchy of the papacy. They are allies against Rome, but only in a negative point of view. They equally resist the claims of popery, but from altogether different positions and in a different spirit. The Greek and Russian Church protests against the papacy from the basis of the Nicene age

and the patriarchal oligarchy of the fourth and fifth centuries. Protestantism protests against it from the modern stand-point of religious freedom and popular self-government. The Greek Church rejects and abhors the papacy as a later innovation, which is, in fact, only a further development of its own hierarchical principle; Protestantism rejects and disowns the papacy as a superseded institution of the past, which has substantially answered its providential purposes and fulfilled its mission, at least as far as the great northern and western nations of Europe and America are concerned, who are the main bearers of the present and future history of the race, and represent the Christian religion in its irresistible motion and progress to the ends of the earth.

Art. IV.—WHEDON ON THE WILL.

The Freedom of the Will as a Basis of Human Responsibility and of Divine Government. By D. D. Whedon, D.D. 12mo., pp. 438. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

The nature, possibility, and explanation of the Freedom of the Will has been hitherto confessedly the *questio vexata* alike of the theologian and the metaphysician.

Dr. Chalmers, in his chapters on Philosophic Necessity, avows his conviction that the controversy on this subject is interminable. To his eye there seemed no promise of a pacific adjustment, and it bore every appearance of remaining a disputed question to the end of time. So far as the suffrages of learned men are concerned there is a powerful array of great names on both sides. We find Leibnitz, Hobbes, Hume, Lord Kames, Jonathan Edwards on the side of philosophic necessity. "And these are countervailed in authority, and greatly more than countervailed in number, by Clarke, Butler, Locke, Reid, and Stewart," (and we may now add Kant, M. de Biran, Cousin, Hamilton, and Mansel,) on the side of freedom. So that a survey of the entire field presented to the mind of Chalmers such organic and radical difference, both as to matters of fact

and first principles, that there seemed no prospect of adjustment by any process of dialectics. There was as "little hope of the disputants coming to one and the same mind, as that two men shall ever come to one and the same place, who have set out on their respective journeys with their backs toward each other."* We cannot, however, be prevailed upon to regard this as an insoluble problem.

Under a reign of causational necessity there can be no moral government, and no just retribution. It is, at best, a mere physical or natural government; for moral government is of beings who are free and self-determined, and not of mere machines. To blame a necessitated thing or being is irrational, to punish it is a cruelty and an injustice. The necessitarian himself is unable to conceal his conscious embarrassment in presence of these difficulties, and to save his theory he becomes reckless in assertions. He affirms that "the whole system of morality—its duties and responsibilities, the whole scheme of moral government with its rewards and punishments, remain, on his theory, as entire and stable as ever."† This affirmation runs athwart all the dictates of common sense, and collides with the universal convictions of humanity. He is the only consistent necessitarian who rejects the Christian doctrine of sin, of accountability and retribution, and reduces the government of God to the mere physical impulsation and management of a universal mechanism. The necessitarian dogma cannot be made to quadrate with our primitive convictions; it is out of harmony with all our instinctive beliefs. The idea of right, the sense of duty and accountability, the consciousness of sin, our faith in the justice of God, our religious hope and fears, all impel us onward to find a rational and "valid basis for human responsibility and Moral Government in the Freedom of the Will."

The manly honesty of Chalmers constrains him to admit that the doctrine of necessity, as taught by Edwards, is identical with that of Hobbes and Hume. All he claims for Edwards is, "that he has succeeded in moralizing and evangelizing the whole argument." He has plundered the arsenal of infidelity, and sanctified the theft by consecrating the stolen arms

* Institutes of Theology, pp. 290, 291. Eng. ed.

† See Chalmers's Institutes, vol. ii, p. 294.

to the service of a despotic God. He employs the doctrine of necessity in the defense of a scheme of systematic theology, inaugurated by St. Augustine, and the *method* of which is thus announced by Chalmers: "Commencing in the fountain head of Deity, and so beginning with the *plans* and *purposes* of God, it passes onward in historical order, through the forthgoings of the Divine administration, which has for its sole principles the Divine WILL and AUTHORITY, and for its subjects the aggregate masses of men."* Commencing thus with *speculations* as to the *purposes* of God, instead of *facts* as to the nature of man—drawing inferences from confessedly incomprehensible truths of revelation, and pushing them, as he says, to their logical consequences, they are found incompatible with the liberty of man, and without inquiring whether he understands the premises from which he argues, or whether his inferences from scripture are legitimate, our conviction of freedom—the universal conviction of our race—is, in accordance with this theological method, cast overboard.

As a consequence of this fundamentally erroneous method the discussion of the freedom of the will necessarily degenerated into a mere war of words—an endless logomachy. Words and not facts were the factors employed in reasoning. "Definitions were dovetailed into each other, which indeed corresponded precisely to each other, but did not *fit the truth of things*."—P. 59. Forms and figures of speech, drawn from mechanical dynamics, were employed, which effectually misled the inquirer's mind, and the whole terminology of the question became false and deceptive. Under these circumstances there was no prospect of a conciliation.

Now if the aim of the disputants be truth and not mere victory—if each desire to understand and fairly meet the arguments of his opponent, and not simply to envelop him in a whirlwind of logical dust, and carry the assault by discharges of verbal grape-shot, then the first and essential requisite is to *settle a clear, precise, and unequivocal terminology.* This necessity is fully recognized by our author, and he has addressed himself to the task with signal and complete success. His nomenclature is in many respects *new.* But his new terms have this rare excellency: they are expressive, rigidly precise,

* Institutes of Theology, vol. ii, p. 485.

mostly univocal, and incapable of misconception or perversion. For the introduction of new terms, or for any peculiarities of style in Dr. Whedon's volume, no apology is needed. He has an indisputable right to this privilege of authorship. And if any justification were needed we would quote the words of Craik on the style of Carlyle. "His mind is a strongly original one, and he would certainly have thought and expressed himself in a way of his own. It will not be easy to find anything which could be changed for the better, or without a loss of part of the meaning designed to be conveyed."*

STATEMENT OF QUESTION, AND DEFINITION OF TERMS.

On contemplating the actions of men in contrast with the events of the material universe and the movements of instinctive brutal forms of sense, we at once recognize an intrinsic and radical difference. The movements of the planetary orbs are regular and uniform, and may be noted and formulated with mathematical precision. Terrestrial changes occur in unbroken succession, the same antecedents being always followed by the same results. The laws of crystalization and chemical affinity are never broken, chloride of sodium never fails to crystalize in a cuboid form, and oxygen and hydrogen combine always in the same definite proportions. Vegetable life and organization are ceaselessly uniform; there is always the same cellular structure, and the same morphological forms. Unreasoning and instinctive life never leaves its sphere. The bee builds the same hexagonal cell she built before the flood. The same impulses arise from an unconscious appetency, and the sensory nerves in the lower orders of the animal kingdom, so exquisitely sensitive to every external and organic impression, respond promptly and uniformly, without deliberation and choice. There is an *all-pervading* ORDER in the physical world.

We look with a closer scrutiny at man himself, and we find him in mysterious relation to the universe around him. His body is subject to the same unvarying laws which govern all other animal organisms. We enter the region of the sensibilities, and we find the same law of uniform sequency that prevails in nature. Pressing upon a sharp instrument, we uniformly experience the sensation of pain. "The Carthagenian

* English Language and Literature, vol. ii, p. 561.

with his eyelids severed could not but see the blazing orb of the sun to which his naked eyeballs were forcibly exposed."—P. 14. We ascend to the higher field of the intellect, and we find that our primitive cognitions are universally uniform. When the muscular organism is resisted we cannot do otherwise than affirm the existence of an external reality. When changes transpire around us we must affirm that they have a cause. So far, then, we find ourselves within the sphere of an all-reigning *order.*

We now enter the sphere of *human activity*—the moral world. And here we find that events do not transpire under a law of uniform sequence. There is *disorder* in a sphere where, above all others, the demand of reason is for order and harmony. The law of right as revealed in the conscience is here violated. There is *ανομιά—lawlessness.* And this lawlessness is universally felt and pronounced to be criminal. We necessarily impute blame when an unjust action is performed by another; we feel conscious of guilt and unworthiness when a wrong is done by ourselves. And we adjudge the lawless man, the sinner, as deserving of punishment. These are facts of universal consciousness. Whatever disasters may overtake us in the course of nature, however we may suffer from the wild tornado, how much soever of our property may be swallowed up by the ocean-tempest, we impute no blame; and we are conscious of essentially different feelings to those we experience when a wrong is intentionally inflicted by our fellow-man.

Now, what is the ground of this fundamental and radical difference between the events of the material universe, and the actions of man? or this difference between our cognitions and feelings, and our acts? And what is the *rational basis* for the different feelings we experience, and the different moral judgments we pass in regard to them?

Our author answers, "the ultimate, ground-difference is found in the fact that one class of acts or events are NECESSARY—there is no adequate power for the thing to be or do otherwise;* the other class of actions is FREE, they need not to have been performed, the agent had power for an opposite choice." In the moral world *liberty* prevails, in the world of

* This is the only correct definition of "necessity." Our author clearly proves that "all necessity is one: the impossibility of a different." (See pp. 48, 49.)

nature *force* reigns. *The grand fundamental principle of difference is found in the* FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

But what is the WILL? and what do we understand by the FREEDOM of the will?

The answer of Dr. Whedon is at once the most exact and comprehensive that has been furnished in the history of this controversy. "*The* WILL *is the power of the soul by which it is the* CONSCIOUS *author of an* INTENTIONAL *act.*"—P. 13. And here the Doctor is careful to remark that by the term "power" or faculty he would simply denote different mental states of the one self-conscious ego.

> When we say the WILL wills, we really mean that the entire soul, or SELF, wills. It is the man who wills, and his will is simply his *power* of being able to will. So it is the man, the soul, the self, that perceives, feels, and thinks. The faculties are not so many divisions of the soul itself, but rather so many classes of the soul's operations, and the soul viewed as capable of being the subject of them. And as in volition the whole soul is the *will*, and in thinking the whole soul is intellect, so it follows that *the will is intelligent and the intelligence is volitional.* When, therefore, we speak of will, we speak not of a separate, blind, unintelligent agent, but of the whole intelligent soul engaged in and capable of volitional action. It is in noway a distinct, a separate substance, or agent.—P. 22.

The importance of these explicit statements cannot be overestimated. The principles here enounced will reappear again and again in the course of the discussion, and, like the touch of Ithuriel's spear, detect and expose many lurking sophisms. We are too apt to think of the faculties of the soul as we do of the functions of material organs: the hand for prehension, the feet for locomotion, the eye for vision, and some absurd partitioning of the hemispheres of the brain as organs of mental operation. "Mental powers are not like bodily organs. It is the same simple substance which exerts energy in every faculty however various, and which is affected in every mode, of every capacity, however diverse."*

The author very justly remarks, "that there is no mental faculty which our consciousness so identifies with SELF as the will."—P. 17. The will is the *ground of* PERSONALITY. That which most eminently signalizes man as a spiritual being dis-

* Hamilton's Metaphysics, p. 267.

tinct from matter or material force—that which makes each man what he is as distinct from all other beings—the central power of our being, the real essence of mind, apart from its regulative laws and formal processes, we think, is the will. Without will man would sink down to the level of impersonal nature; in the words of Dr. Bushnell, he would be a *thing* and not a *power*.

This power of the soul by which man becomes the conscious author of an intentional act is the *power of* CAUSALITY. "The proper characteristic of the ME is causality or will."* Indeed, the will is the only analogon of power, and we can form no conception of a cause except in and by the causation of the will.† Every free agent is therefore within his sphere an *efficient cause*—"*an original creator even out of nothing.*"—P. 42. He has the power of causing to be that which before had no existence, of starting *de novo* and realizing what Hamilton so dogmatically affirms is inconceivable, "A BEGINNING." "The sinner takes into himself the anterior causations and influences, and by his own transmuting and originating power *creates* out of them a new and evil existence," (p. 42,) which is SIN.

But when we say that the will is a power, do we mean thereby that it is a nature-force capable indeed of originating motion, but only in one given direction, and of effectuating, in the same given circumstances, one only possible result? Dr. Whedon's answer to the question furnishes the only correct definition we have yet seen of the Freedom of the Will. Mansel, in his "Prolegomena," doubts whether there be any definition of free-will extant which does not imply an antecedent will, and is consequently involved in the "infinite series" of the necessitarian. We are now presented with one which is impregnable to all the assaults of verbal criticism, and clearly disengaged from the coils of the infinite series. "*The will has the power or immunity to put forth in the same unchanged circumstances either of several volitions, or, supposing a given volition to be in the agent's contemplation, it is the unrestricted power of putting forth in the same circumstances a different volition instead.*"—P. 25. This is ALTERNATIVITY.

* Cousin.

† For "Power is positively concurred only in the form of ability to choose between two alternatives." Mansel's Prolegomena Logica, p. 277.

Mechanical freedom to an action is exemption from all impediment or preventive of positive action, and so is freedom solely TO the act. *Voluntary* freedom is exemption from [extrinsic] impediment to the being or doing as we will, and is freedom TO or FROM a certain post-volitional act. *Volitional* freedom, in regard to a given volition, is immunity to put forth it or other volitions, and is freedom TO and FROM. Power solely to a thing being in the given case, and with the given motive, without alteriety or alternativity, we call an inalternative power, in opposition to a power which, being at once either to or from, we call ALTERNATIVITY. We extend the term to any number of different alternatives. The alternativity is as extensive as the disjunctive prepositions which should enumerate them. Thus, this, or that, or the other, or still another, is the possible object of an alternative choice.—P. 26.

The will is, then, in the strictest and fullest sense an *efficient* CAUSE. "It CREATES, brings into existence, shapes, and limits its volitions."—P. 118. It causes its own volitions without any cause out of or back of itself. "Self is *solely* and *uncausedly* the cause."—P. 118.

The grand question which remains therefore is, does man possess a pluri-efficient power, is he an alternative cause? Has he liberty TO an act and FROM an act? Is he free to choose in the same unchanged circumstances either of several ways?

When a man is morally obligated or divinely commanded to will otherwise than he does, the question immediately arises, Can he will otherwise than he does will? Is he free FROM, as well as TO, this act? *Or is he limited by necessity to will just this* ONE *way?* Suppose that *one way* to be contrary to the command of God, or to his own best reason, or to the obligations of eternal right, or to his endless well-being; still between that way and his Will is there a sure tie securing that the disastrous volition shall be put forth? Is there any fate, predestination, antecedent causation, or law of invariable sequence by which, all other directions being excluded, the will is, like a mechanism, limited to one sole way? The moment these questions are asked the great debate between necessity and freedom commences.—P. 25.

To this question, "Can a man in the same circumstances will otherwise than he does will, in obedience to the Divine command?" the materialist, and the purely philosophic necessitarian answers with a prompt and decided *No!* and he openly avows all the logical consequences which inevitably follow.

Man is not, cannot be held responsible, for he has no power to will otherwise than he does will. *God is not a moral Governor.* Penal retributions can have no place under such an economy.

But the theologico-philosophical necessitarian does not meet the question promptly and squarely. Should he answer "yes," he knows the doctrine of "unconditional predestination" is stranded. Should he answer "No," he feels that responsibility and retribution are wrecked. He would therefore avoid the Scylla and Charybdis of this perilous navigation by tacking and maneuvering with the words "freedom" and "necessity."

With a peculiar adroitness this class of necessitarians affirm that man is "FREE." "He has the power of *doing* as he pleases." He is free from all extrinsic impediment to the *doing* as he will. He is "under no restraint;" he is not hindered from acting according to his will. He is "subject to no constraint;" he is not compelled to do anything against his will. He has "natural" or physical ability. And this Edwards boastingly asserts "is the highest kind of liberty conceivable," and "perfectly consistent with necessity." Freedom and necessity are one. By this subterfuge he thinks he has saved responsibility and moral government.

But as Dr. Whedon has abundantly shown, (pp. 28–39,) this is *no freedom of the Will at all.* It is a freedom not to *will* but to *do.* It is not located in the will, but in the muscular organism; it is freedom of post-volitional operation. And this is no more than the freedom of a machine to move as it is moved, a freedom TO an act, but not *from* the act. The clock runs freely when there is no impediment. The railroad car runs freely when the brakes are removed. The river glides freely of its own sweet will when there are no obstructions. All actions, modes, states of men or machines are thus equally "fixed" and equally "free." A free action is simply an action. The word "free" is an unmeaning expletive. The most absolute necessity is the most perfect freedom.

Edwards also equivocates strangely with the words "certainty" and "necessity." "Metaphysical or philosophic necessity is nothing different from certainty." But here he used the word "certainty" in a sense peculiarly his own, and op-

posed to the consensus and use of all mankind. The etymology of the term CERTAINTY, from *cerno*=κρίνω, I adjudge, shows that its primary meaning is *subjective.** "Certainty in its primary sense is applied to the state of a person's mind. . . . Thus we say 'It is certain,' meaning simply *we* are sure; whereas the fact may be *uncertain* and *certain* to different individuals."† But this is not the sense in which it is used by Edwards. He uses the term certainty as synonymous with *his* necessity, and not the term necessity as synonymous with *our* certainty. Edwards's "necessity" is that which is "fixed," "made sure," "impossible that it should be otherwise," "a firm and sure connection," as of cause and effect; all which amount in reality to the exact definition of Dr. Whedon's. "Necessity in a thing is the nonexistence therein of adequate power for the thing to be otherwise than it is."—P. 48. This necessity of Edwards's excludes all power for a contrary choice, which indeed he pronounces "*impossible*" and "*unthinkable.*"

"Edwards's '*certainty*' is therefore absolute causational necessity; and when the exigencies of the debate compel him to define his 'freedom,' it is the absolute subjection of being and action to a necessary causation."—P. 68.

All fatalists, materialists, necessitarians, predestinationists, must therefore stand in one category. To the question, "Can man, in obedience to the Divine requirement, *will otherwise than he does will?*" they must all answer No! The freedomist alone can answer Yes! else God would not require him to will otherwise, and could not in justice punish him for not willing otherwise!

If the preceding principles, which are stated with so much clearness, and sustained with so much logical force by Dr. Whedon in this volume, be fully apprehended by the reader, he will have no difficulty in disposing of the arguments of the necessitarian. The fundamental principles upon which they are based are already swept away. We need do no more than present a succinct statement of these arguments, and show how, in the application of the foregoing principles enounced by Dr. Whedon, they are emptied of all their force.

* Page 57. † Whateley's Logic. Appendix, p. 1.

I. The first is the Metaphysical or Causational Argument.

The rational intuition that "every event must have a cause," is a universal and necessary truth. It must therefore be rigorously applied to all mental, as well as to all physical phenomena. Every volition must have a cause, and if caused it cannot be *free*. This is the grand argument upon which the necessitarian mainly relies, and it is urged with eloquence and force by Edwards, Chalmers, and M'Cosh.

Now that "every event must have a cause" is an *à priori* truth, which is as readily accorded by the freedomist as it is vehemently insisted upon by the necessitarian. No philosophic writers have more ably and clearly enounced this law of causality than the freedomists Reed, Stewart, and Cousin. They rely upon it as one of the main pillars of the Theistic argument. And they apply it, in all its integrity, to mental as well as physical phenomena. They hesitate not to say that "*every volition must have a cause.*" That cause is the efficient creative power which resides in a free, spiritual personality. And that power is not, like a material or physical cause, shut up to one sole mode of effectuation; it is an *alternative* power, a *pluri*efficient cause. Where then is the discrepancy between the universal principle of causality and the doctrine of alternative causation? Is the Infinite First Cause confined to one solely possible mode of effectuation? If so, how will you account for the endlessly varied effects which appear in the physical universe? God is the Eternal ONE; whence the plurality and diversity of his creative acts, if he be not an *equi*potent cause? And yet of all the events which have transpired in the universe, whether natural or supernatural, we affirm "every event must have had a cause."* The endless diversity of effects which originate in the alternative causation of God is in perfect harmony with this universal law of causality.

But on a closer examination it will be found that when the necessitarian attempts to invalidate our consciousness of alternative power by the application of the causational argument he adroitly shifts his ground. He assumes "another proposition

* "The miraculous interpositions recorded in scriptures are not inconsistent with this fundamental axiom, for they are effects of the will of God as a *cause*."—M'Cosh's "Divine Government," p. 113.

which is neither equivalent to the above axiom, nor in itself axiomatic and self-evident, nor justifiably assumed without proof."—P. 84. M'Cosh says "the doctrine of necessity is founded on the intellectual intuitions of man's mind, which lead us, in mental as in material phenomena, to anticipate the *same* effects to follow the *same* causes;"*—that is, every cause is *inalternative* or *unipotent*, one effect, and only one can follow.

Now that a given phenomena must have *a* cause is one assertion; that the *same* cause will again and forever produce the *same* effect is another. The first is an *axiom*, the second is an *induction*. That "every event must have a cause," is a rational intuition. That "like causes will produce always like effects," is a generalization from our limited experience; and on a further analysis will be found to apply only to our cognitions of the *material* universe. It is simply grounded on what we know empirically of the uniformity of nature. Now we have no *à priori* intuitive conviction of the uniformity of nature. As the result of maturer thought, M'Cosh admits this in his later work on the "Intuitions of the Mind." "It is vain to speak of the belief in the uniformity of nature as a self-evident, a necessary, or a universal truth."—P. 276. It is perfectly conceivable that the world might have been so constituted that there should have been no regularity in the succession of events. The causes of all the events in nature might have been *supernatural*, and consisted in the immediate free volitions of the Deity, or subordinate angelic agencies.† They might have been all "miraculous," and yet the true law of causality would not have been violated, or any way invalidated. And so when man, in the exercise of his free alternative power, produces a new succession of events in physical nature, or moves disorder and *ἀνομιά* into the moral sphere, this is no way inconsistent with the axiom that "every event has a cause."

In our very definition of freedom of will we assume in the volitional sphere the inapplicability of the maxim that "like causes ever and always produce like effects." We assume that *either* one of several effects is legitimate from the *same* cause. And while

* P. 541 Divine Government, Physical and Moral.

† See M'Cosh's Divine Government, p. 113, and Mill's Logic, p. 114, vol. ii, English edition.

we admit that in non-volitional causation the law that "every event must have a cause," means that every event must have its own peculiar cause, adequate for itself alone, in volitional causation an event may have a cause adequate either for it or for other event; and whichever event exists, the *demands of the laws of causation are completely satisfied.*—P. 87.

Driven from this boasted stronghold, the necessitarian resorts to his favorite dialectic strategy. He demands the explanation of equipotent causation, how one cause can be adequate to several effects. He asks, "*What causes the will to put forth one particular volition rather than another?*"

Now when we have shown, that, as a fact of consciousness and experience a personal, *spiritual* cause is adequate to several results, we are entitled in reason and justice to protest against any attempt to push the inquiry a step further. We have attained an ultimate fact, and we have no right to cast doubt upon its authority by raising perplexing questions as to the *how* or *why* of that which IS. This is precisely the method by which the atheist Holyoke would invalidate the argument for the existence of the Infinite First Cause. He subjects the Deity to this universal law of causality, and asks, What caused the Creator to create? "The atheist holds that the universe is an endless series of causes and effects *ad infinitum*, and therefore the idea of a *first* cause is an absurdity and a contradiction." The "infinite series" of Edwards and of Holyoke are constructed on the same method. They both ask *a* cause for *the* cause.

When therefore it is asked, "What causes the will to cause one volition rather than another?" our author's answer is, "NOTHING *whatever!*"

Of its own effect, WILL, in its proper conditions, is not a partial, but a full and adequate cause. Put your finger upon any effect (volition) and ask, What caused this result exclusively of the other? and the reply is, The Will, or the agent in willing. Ask then what caused the will in its conditions to cause the volition, and the reply is, NOTHING. Nay, you are a bad philosopher in asking.. For, for its own effect Will or the willing agent is a complete cause: as complete a cause as any cause whatever; *and every complete cause produces its effect* UNCAUSEDLY. The volition, like every other effect, is completely accounted for when a complete cause is assigned. To ask what caused the complete cause to produce the effect, is to ask the cause of causation.—P. 93.

But such an "alternative" power, the necessitarian affirms, is incomprehensible and inexplicable. To which we need only reply in the language of Hamilton, "The scheme of freedom is no more incomprehensible than the scheme of necessity."* "*Omnia exeunt in mysterium*"—there is nothing the absolute ground of which is not a mystery. In saying so much, however, we by no means grant the affirmation of Hamilton, that "we are unable to conceive an absolute commencement (of being or motion;) we cannot therefore conceive a free volition."† This is not admitted by Mansel, the disciple and annotator of Hamilton, as flowing even from his mental "law of the conditioned." "It may be true as a fact that no material atom has been added to the world since the first creation; but the assertion, however true, is certainly not *necessary*. The power which created once must be conceived as able to create again, whether that ability is actually exercised or not. The same conclusion is still more evident when we proceed from the consideration of matter to that of mind. Of matter we maintain that the creation of new portions is perfectly conceivable as a result, if not as a process. Every man who comes into the world comes into it as a distinct individual, having a personality and consciousness of his own; and that personality is a distinct accession to the number of persons previously existing. . . . *I believe that every new person that comes into the world is, as a person, a* NEW *existence.*"‡ So a volition is a *new* existence, an absolute origination, "a beginning of motion" which has its source in the primordial power of the human spirit as spirit. The *fact* is undeniable, the *mode* is inexplicable. But the inconceivability of the mode in which the will creates a volition no more renders the fact doubtful, than the impossibility of conceiving how a new and distinct self-conscious personality comes into existence invalidates the fact that "I exist, and know myself as a distinctly existing being."

II. The Psychological Argument.

This may be briefly stated in the following terms:

It is a fact of observation and experience that *motives* do stand to the will in the relation of *causes* which necessitate

* Philosophy, p. 511. † Philosophy, p. 508.

‡ Prolegomena Logica. Appendix, note C.

volition. They have an exact mathematical commensurability, and their prevalence is in the precise ratio of their antecedent intrinsic *strength*. If motives are wanting there can be no choice; but when the same motives are presented to the same mind, it obeys them with such remarkable *uniformity*, that human actions may be reduced to statistical tables as reliable and as accurate as tables of mortality.

We might here at once, and with justice, enter our caveat against the attempt to invalidate a primitive datum of consciousness by alleged deductions from the exterior phenomena of human life and history. A primitive datum of consciousness is unquestionable and infallible. A process of induction is liable to the interpolations of error. The latter is therefore a lesser authority than the former, and a merely derivative assurance cannot be argued against an ultimate fact. We must regard it as a philosophic canon that an experience cognition cannot conflict with an intuitive belief. The exterior phenomena of life and history, properly interpreted, must harmonize with the interior facts and laws of the human mind, for what is *history* but the development, under the conditions and relations of time, of the primitive powers, ideas, and laws of humanity? If, then, consciousness attests the presence in man's spiritual nature of a power, in the same circumstances, to choose either of several ways, we may confidently expect that the phenomena of the moral world will not belie that testimony. Now it is a palpable fact that an unbroken law of continuity and uniformity pervades the material universe. It is locked up in an unchangeable status. There is no deviation and no progression. All things remain as they were since the beginning. The fundamental fact lying at the basis of this undeviating uniformity of nature is "*that material causes are* UNIPOTENT, *and shut up to one solely possible mode of effectuation.*"* And it is equally palpable that the phenomena of the moral world, the sphere of human life and history, reveals contingency, diversity, alteriety, and progression. Humanity has not revolved in cycles, neither has it run in the inflexible moulds of an anterior causation, nor remained in the dead-lock of an unchangeable status. History is not an inflexible frame-work into which all events have flowed by necessity;

* Page 32.

it is a development of the inherent powers and capabilities of humanity, and it teaches us that new trains of causes have been originated, and new conditions have been superinduced by man. The ground-fact which underlies all the diversity, contingency, and progress which appears in the moral world is, *that volitional causes are* EQUIPOTENT *and efficient for any one of the several results.** In moral development the *progressive* principle is just the *freedom of the will.* The facts of the inner and outer world are therefore in harmony.

The theory of the necessitarian *assumes* that the Will is a mere passivity, a simple conductor of the impulse which motive power exerts, a mere transition-point where ideal force is transformed into physical force, and desires, inclinations, moral convictions, divine influences become necessary acts. Motives thus prevail by their antecedent intrinsic power just as physical forces prevail in mechanical and vital dynamics. And, proceeding upon this assumption, he labors to construct a science of Ethology in which he would anticipate human action by statistics, and show how individual character *must* be in accordance with physical and mental causation. Whereas consciousness asserts the will "is not a bleak mechanical thing." It is a free, alternative power. It is a full, complete adequate cause. It is *spirit*, not matter.

Now it is freely granted by our author that the mind acts in view of motives, acts in accordance with motives, acts in a certain qualified sense under the influence of motives; *but he emphatically denies that the will is necessitated to action by motives.* Motives may be reason *for* action, conditions under which will acts, but they are not causes *of* action. They may solicit, invite, urge to action, but they cannot constrain, compel, and force action.

Motives have no fixed correlation to the will. They address themselves to the feelings, the judgment, the conscience, and not directly and immediately to the will. They may awaken desire, fear, inclination, preference, a sense of obligation; but these are all states of the intellect and sensibility, and may coexist in the same mind, with a state of indetermination and non-differentiation in the will. That which is desirable may appeal to the feelings, that which is eligible to the judgment,

* Page 56.

that which is obligatory to the conscience, and these may excite the mind in different degrees of intensity; but none of them have power to move the will. We may be able intellectually to perceive that some motives are intrinsically "higher" than others, that some have a prevolition power to excite all minds more intensely than others; but they do not prevail and secure action in any ratio with their supposed *à priori* strength. They can only become real motives for the will by its voluntary placing its interest in them and making them objects of its choice.* All the actual strength which a motive has is derived from the action of the will. Dr. Whedon hereupon advances the following fundamental propositions:

1. *The so-called strength of a motive is the degree of* PROBABILITY *that the will will act in accordance with, or on account of it.*

"And it is most important to remark that the *result* is not always, nor in most cases, necessarily as the *highest probability*. The will may choose for the higher or for the lower. And as the will may choose for a lower rather than a higher probability, so the will may choose on account of what is called antecedently a *weaker* over a *stronger* motive. And hereby is once for all established the difference between mechanical force and motive influence, that whereas in the former, by necessity, the greater effect results from the greater force; in the latter the less is possible from the greater, the greater from the less."† That result is not as the highest probability, Dr. Whedon has shown most conclusively from the Doctrine of Contingences or Probabilities. (Pp. 130, 135.) And on this he grounds his doctrine of *contingent motive probability.*

This contingent character of motive influence is correspondent with the alternative character of that which is its sole possible object—Will. An alternative Will and a contingent motive influence are correlatives. They mutually explain and sustain each other. To admit either is to admit both. And so a unipotent will and a necessary motive influence are correlatives. He who is compelled to admit one is compelled to admit the other. It will be a mere controversy about a word to say that an influence which does not produce effect is no influence. That may legitimately be called an influence, it is important to add, which is conceived as *possessing an intrinsic probability for result, though the higher probability be a contingency* for which there exists power of *fail-*

* Müller's Christian Doctrine of Sin, vol. ii, p. 56. † Page 130.

ure. If so, then the doctrine of contingent motive influence is established, and the doctrine of volitional necessity is at an end. The relation between physical force and effect is *necessary.* The relation between motive and volition is *contingent.*—P. 135.

2. *The so-called strength of a motive is the comparative prevalence which the will assigns to it by its own action.*

It is impossible to erect any standard by which the intrinsic "strength" of motives can be determined previous to volition. "A cold intellection is not intrinsically commensurable with a deep emotion; nor a sentiment of taste with a feeling of obligation, nor a physical appetite with a sense of honor."—P. 147. Now by what standard can the comparative force of these influences be determined? There is no more commensurability between them than between "the brightness of day and the force of magnetic attractions." Or if we could possibly determine, by some rational *à priori* method, that a feeling of obligation is intrinsically stronger than a physical appetite, or that the love of life is stronger *per se* than a sense of duty, we *cannot affirm that the one or the other shall therefore uniformly and necessarily prevail.* These influences derive all their prevalency, and consequently their comparative strength of motive, *from the will alone.* The will places its interest in the one or the other. It decides the mental position. "It settles the question of preferences between alternatives, dismisses the counter motive from view, and closes the debate."—P. 193.

The "strength" of a motive, in its relation to the will, can only be known by this test of *prevalency.* This is unwittingly conceded by the necessitarian. He says "that the strongest motive prevails because that is the strongest which the will chooses." This really concedes the position assumed by Dr. Whedon, "that the strength of a motive is the comparative prevalence which the will, in its own action, assigns to it, or the nearness to which the will comes to acting on account of it." Men do not always choose that which is most *desirable* nor that which is most *eligible*, nor that which appears most *obligatory.* But from whatever motive men may choose to act, however base and unworthy, the necessitarian affirms it was intrinsically the strongest motive *because* it was chosen; which simply amounts to this—the strongest motive is always chosen because the motive chosen is always the strongest motive.

The attempts of the necessitarian to fix upon some standard by which to estimate the antecedent strength of motives have all signally failed. The most plausible is that of Edwards. He asserts that the volition is always as the greatest *apparent* good. But by what standard is that good estimated, by which faculty is it recognized and pronounced *good?* by the reason, the conscience, the judgment, or the appetites? Can that be pronounced *good* which is chosen in obedience to passion and lust? Does the man who inflicts a premeditated injury upon his neighbor choose the greatest apparent good? Does the murderer believe that in taking away the life of his fellow-man "the volition is as the greatest apparent good?" Certainly not. "Never," says Bushnell, "was there a case of wrong, a sinful choice, in which the agent believes he was choosing for the strongest, weightiest, or most valuable motives." The great mass of sinful men are conscious of choosing sinful indulgence against their "highest good."

3. *Motives are the conditions, but not the causes of volition.*

"Of volitions the cause, the sole cause, is Will. Motives are collateral conditions . . . for the volition to be; with which there is adequate power for the volition not to be. The motive is only the *occasion*, and all its acts of excitement amount to no more than this, that they stand as *probable conditions* opening the way toward which the will thereby acquires opportunity to act with full adequate power of not acting."—P. 158. The relation between motive and volition is not a necessary but a contingent relation. The will is the controlling conscious self in the exercise of direct causative power in producing volition.

Some modern writers of the necessitarian school, M'Cosh for example, admit the existence of "self-activity" in the will. But what can be the meaning of "self-activity" if the will has not power of either resisting or yielding to motives presented, and in the same unchanged circumstances of choosing a different alternative? To be moved absolutely by motives is not *self*-movement. A power to move in only one given direction is a mere nature-force; it cannot be self-activity. The distinguished writer above named also admits that "*causation in the will is entirely different from causation in other actions.*"*

* Intuition, etc., p. 472.

If he mean that motives act upon the will in an "entirely different" manner to that by which physical causes secure action or change in the material world, what right has he to call that *causation* at all? And if he mean that volitional causation is "alternative," and not, like physical causation, "unipotent," then the controversy is at an end.

4. *We have no such experience of "uniformities of volition" as shall enable us to generalize a universal law of volitional causation.*

The facts of uniformity which present themselves in the continuous life of some men who were absorbed in one great life-purpose, as also in the conduct of aggregate masses of men, are not denied by Dr. Whedon. He affirms that his very definition of a free Will supposes that it may choose in a generally uniform manner. Much of the uniformity in the life of an individual may be accounted for by corporeal nature, Disposition, Standard purpose, and Habit. The remarks in chapter five on the influence of these in the development of character are full of sound philosophy, and are of great practical value. The general results reached are thus summed up: "Upon a basis of corporeal, psychological, and mental nature, are overlaid a primary stratum of dispositions blending the natural and the volitional, and a secondary formation of generic purposes wholly volitional, and formed by repetition into a tertiary of habits; and thus we have, in his mingled constitution of necessitation and freedom, an agent prepared for daily responsible action."—P. 171.

Dr. Whedon consequently rejects equally the doctrine of the "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," that character is *necessitated*, and the doctrine of the Calvinistic theologian, that character is *necessitative*. The Princeton Essayists assert "that the direction of choice under motives is determined by the moral state of the actor."* But to explain, on this theory, "how the first holy angels sinned, how the first Adam fell, how the second Adam was really tempted, how in a holy universe transgression could originate, would puzzle the Essayist."—P. 171.

Now it may be readily granted that character forms a basis of reliable *probability* as to how in given circumstances a man will act. We may be able to judge, with some degree of

* Essays, p. 255.

accuracy, how a man will work in his freedom; but we can never calculate with absolute certainty, because we have numberless examples of men's acting strangely "out of character," and disappointing our most confident expectations.

> There is often the action, great or small, which reverses the record of a life, or a protracted course of action. He who well watches his neighbor, however blind he may be to his own practical self-contradictions, is sure to find, even in the life most even in its great outline, plenty of minor inconsistencies. Or as Müller, in his Doctrine of Sin, well says, that both our observation and our subject's temptation may occur just at the moment of one of his great volitional turning points. From the apostacy of the first angels, and the fall of man through the whole course of human history, we have innumerable instances of revolutionary volitions, not only *out of the previous character*, but shaping a *new* character. The one disastrous sin of Moses, the one great complicated crime of David, the apostacy of Solomon, the wisest of men, are all proofs how, not only in contrasted traits, but in revolutionary acts, a man may be
>
> "The wisest, greatest, meanest of mankind."—P. 173.

Statistics are cited by Buckle, in his "History of Civilization in England," showing that Crimes, Suicides, Marriages, etc., occur with remarkable uniformity, as the result of general conditions of human society; and he thence infers that all the actions of men are governed by a uniform law of causation. This uniformity may however be as easily accounted for on the doctrine of freedom as on the doctrine of necessity. "In the calculations of contingencies, as we have very fully said, (p. 130,) while results of compared large aggregates in the same conditions may approach equality, the *contingency of each individual case remains still a contingency.*"—P. 176. The actuary of an insurance company can assert with accuracy the average duration of human life in different countries; but were he to attempt to predict the duration of any one individual life he had insured he would certainly fail. The insured may falsify his predictions by a voluntary act of suicide. "So though large aggregations of free volitions, surrounded by the same motives, may approach equality, the *freedom of the individual Will remains.*"—P. 176.

And as Mansel very justly remarks, "it is precisely because individual actions are not reducible to any fixed law, or capable of representation by any numerical calculation, that the statis-

tical averages acquire their value as substitutes. No one dreams of applying statistical averages to calculate the period of the earth's rotation by showing that four and twenty hours is the exact medium of time comparing one month's or one year's revolutions with another's. It is only when individual movements are irregular that it is necessary to aim at a proximate regularity by calculating in mass."*

III. The Theological Argument.

We regret that our limited space will not permit a full exhibition of the masterly treatment of this branch of the necessitarian argument by Dr. Whedon.

The main points of the Theological Argument may be thus presented: Freedom in a created being is incompatible with the absolute sovereignty and prescience of God. To suppose a being capable of acting either of several ways, is to suppose a being out of the control of God. And a free agent cannot possess power to do otherwise than God foreknows he will do.

In regard to the first of these supposed incompatibilities we need only remark that if the Deity, in order to the existence of an equitable moral government, and the consequent possibility of free responsible action by the creature, shall please to subject his omnipotence to conditional limitations, the necessitarian has no business to object. We need feel no solicitude about the Divine Sovereignty. God will take care of his own honor and defend his own high and holy prerogatives. Such self-limiting laws prescribed by Divine Wisdom and Love do not place man beyond divine control. The necessitarian will not deny that such self-limitation is essential to the very existence of the kingdom of nature. God has established an order in nature, a uniformity of antecedence and sequence, with which Omnipotence shall not interfere. "Such a divine law of non-usance of power is still more necessary in the kingdom of living agents, and most of all in the realm of responsible agents; it being observable that the more close the divine self-restraint, and the larger the amount of powers in the agent left untouched, the more the creative system rises in dignity, and the higher God appears as a sovereign. Even in the system of living *necessitated* agents, as necessitarians must admit,

* Prolegomena, p. 280.

God forbids himself to disturb the agent's uniform and perpetual acting according to strongest motive."—P. 320.

The second of these incompatibilities is really predicated upon our ignorance, and not upon our knowledge. We cannot understand *how* the Divine Intelligence foreknows all future events. To enable us to understand the exact manner in which an Infinite intelligence contemplates succession in time, it would be necessary that we should be infinite also. The *fact* that God foreknows all future events is all that is revealed to us; the *manner* of it he has left in darkness, and we can throw no light upon it by our verbal speculations.

Of one thing we may rest assured, that as perception precedes volition in the finite intelligence, so knowledge must precede determination in the Divine Mind. God cannot will or act in absolute darkness. Divine predestination must be conditioned on Divine foreknowledge.* His foreknowledge does not depend upon his will, or on the adjustment of motives to make us will thus and thus; but he foreknows every thing first conditionally, in the world of possibility, before he creates, or determines anything to be, in the world of fact. Otherwise, all his purposes would be grounded in ignorance, not in wisdom, and his knowledge would consist in following after his will, to learn what it had blindly determined.†

Another important principle clearly and vigorously maintained by Dr. Whedon is, "*that the* FREENESS *of an act is* NOT AFFECTED BY *the consideration of its being* FOREKNOWN." First, because the Divine knowledge must always correspond to the reality. A free action must be known as *free*. "If there be in the free agent, ascertained by psychology, or required by intuition, or supposably seen by the Divine eye, the power of putting forth a volition with full power of alteriety, then *God knows that power*."—P. 273. Secondly, the occurrence of an event or act may be *certain* to Divine foreknowledge and yet perfectly *contingent* in itself. Foreknowledge renders nothing *necessary; it is the consequence, not the cause of events.*

If there be a necessity at all in the case, "THE NECESSITY LIES NOT UPON THE FREE ACT BUT UPON THE KNOWLEDGE. The

* This is unquestionably the doctrine of Scripture, "Whom he *foreknew*, them also he did predestinate."

† Bushnell's "Natural and Supernatural," p. 50.

foreknowledge must see to its own accuracy. Pure knowledge, temporal or eternal, must conform itself to the fact, not the fact to the knowledge. Knowledge, by its very nature, *accepts the fact as it is.* . . . The act is by no necessity bound to conform to or be connected with the knowledge. It is perfectly free to contradict the knowledge, and the knowledge must take care of itself. The act can be as it pleases, and the knowledge must conform."—P. 284.

The nature of the POSITIVE ARGUMENT *for the Freedom of the Will* will have been already suggested to the reader during the course of this discussion.

We are conscious that we possess a power of alternative choice. By the same faculty by which we know that *we exist*, do we also know that we have the *fullest, freest choice.* The universal consciousness of our race is revealed in the history of the past, in the languages which men have spoken, in the laws which men have enacted, in the institutions they have framed. And in all these we see that men, in all ages, have believed that man was the master and *maker* of his own actions, and *responsible* for them, and they have, in every age, praised or blamed, rewarded or punished accordingly. The idea of duty has been to every human mind an omnipresent reality, so that all languages abound with the correlatives of "ought" and "ought not," of duty and obligation, of praise and blame. All this clearly indicates that *freedom is a fact of universal consciousness.* A divine command to make a contrary choice supposes adequate power to make that choice. There can be no responsibility, and no moral desert without power of contrary choice. Power underlies all responsibility. A created moral desert is an absolute impossibility. And upon no other theory can we establish God's non-authorship of sin, or vindicate the righteousness of his administration. *Freedom is the only condition of a possible Theodicy.* These are all common-sense propositions, and they are urged with resistless force by Dr. Whedon in Part III, to which we invite the reader's careful attention.

There are some chapters of extraordinary power and grandeur in this volume, to which we would esteem it a pleasure to direct the reader's attention, but we must forbear. The one

on the "Equation of Probational Advantages" is alike honorable to the heart and head of Dr. Whedon. The reading of that chapter is full of consolation to the Christian heart. It relieves the sadness which the moral aspect of the world induces, fills us with intense sympathy for our suffering race, and materially quickens our missionary zeal.

We should have been gratified by a more extended discussion of this great question in view of the *Eighth* of our Articles of Faith, together with some historical and critical notices of the Anthropology of Augustine, Anselm, and Arminius. Nevertheless we hesitate not to pronounce it the most masterly and exhaustive discussion of the subject in the English language.

Art. V.—THE NIBELUNGEN LIED.

Der Nibelunge Nôth. Urtext mit gegenübenstehender Uebersetzung, nebst Einleitung und Wörterbuch, herausgegeben von Dr. Ludwig Braunfels. 16mo., pp. 597. Frankfurt am Main: 1846.

Das Nibelungen Lied, herausgegeben durch Friedrich Heinrich von der Hagen. 12mo., pp. 598. Berlin: 1807.

The reader is invited to make with us a visit to the rude Gothic ancestry of many of our countrymen in a notice of the great German epic, the Nibelungen Lied. The admirers of the Iliad and its Latin imitation, among whom we desire to be classed, may deem a comparison of these poems an insult to the Greek and Roman, and so to all Christendom as the legitimate heir of the two latter. August Wilhelm von Schlegel, however, the distinguished German critic, the author of the best translation ever made of Shakspeare, has instituted such comparison, concluding rather in favor of the German work. We shall notice the poem more in detail than he has done.

The question has been much discussed whether the Homeric poems are the work of one mind. Even intelligent admirers of Greek antiquity once regarded this discussion as almost an impiety. In our school days we were among the zealous defenders of the unity of the authorship of these poems, and

if Homer had been a personal friend, we could not have felt more indignant at a hint to the contrary. Now, however, without a reason more or less on either side, except the subjective conviction that it never lay in human nature to open the drama of the world's literature with a dignity and beauty which has seldom been attained in the nearly three thousand years of its progress, we deem nothing more absurd than this supposition. It would realize the fable of Minerva springing in full armor from Jupiter's head, and would make Homer not only without peers, but without analogies. It would present the literature of the world as opening with an epic which many still regard as peerless; as starting from a height which successive generations for nearly three thousand years have been vainly, as many think, toiling to regain.

The great rivers are formed from the union of smaller streams; these in turn are made up of murmuring brooks, which come from rippling rills, each of which is traceable to some bubbling spring in mountain or valley. The traveler chances to stand upon the banks of a noble river, broad, deep, and clear. It reflects with unwonted distinctness, from its smooth and glassy surface, a sky of purer azure, fleecy clouds of more beautiful whiteness than those of other lands, with cities and villages such as he could not have hoped to see, peopled by a race nobler in aspect and mien than any which he has met, as if belonging somewhere between our race and superior beings, with country diversified by hill and dale, clothed with pastures in which graze the finest flocks and herds. He attempts to trace this river to its sources, but meets with impassible obstacles, marshes and swamps flanked by inaccessible mountains. Does he, because he cannot trace it, conclude, that, unlike all other rivers, it is without these tributaries, and springs thus broad and deep out of the earth, at once a river?

As to unity of authorship, the Iliad and the Nibelungen Lied must finally stand upon the same ground. Whether there ever was such a man as Homer is doubtful. Few men have investigated so thoroughly or written so well on the Homeric poems as Mr. Grote, and he inclines to the negative. We shall all consent, however, to let the name remain. We must suppose some man—we may as well call him Homer as anything else—of greater genius than the rest of those who in successive ages

contributed to this work; a man capable of seizing the existing material and doing the chief work of moulding it into its present shape; for the opinion to which Grote leans, that many persons united their labors, each having his part assigned in the production of the Homeric epics, is too unlike the way in which authors act, not to mention the improbability of even two, much less a dozen or more, uniting together and possessing the requisite talents, unless, indeed, it can be shown that great poets were, at that day, a more natural production and more ready to co-operate with each other than they have been since. Emerson says, "Every novel is debtor to Homer," and the remark is noteworthy for the extent and pointedness of its truth; but Emerson says nothing of Homer's indebtedness. This lay beyond his or any other man's field of inquiry. The creditors' claims are outlawed, or their evidence is lost. If, however, the truth could be known, Homer would be found indebted to Ionic bards who preceded him and whose names and works have perished; and, what has seldom been true of others, he would be found still more deeply indebted to some who lived long after him.

The Iliad has come down to us with the name of an author: tradition assigns him a birthplace, Scio's rocky isle, though it tells us that seven cities contended for the honor of his birth. It gives him some marked physical attributes, as blindness, and gives other elements, unfortunately too many, from which we may form a person. Taking for granted this person's sole authorship of this epic, our admiration for him has become intense, has grown into a personal friendship which has foiled all our efforts to distribute this glory. This is a beautiful instance of begging the question. The poem proves that Homer was a wonderful man, and then it needs no proof that so wonderful a man could have written the poem.

This is our logic, but, like many German philosophers who destroy the foundations of faith in their philosophy, and are still devout in the Church, so we in theory renounce our faith in Homer, but do not allow him to be dislodged from his stronghold in the heart.

On the contrary the Nibelungen Lied comes to us without the name of an author. There is no blindness or other misfortune to excite our commiseration; no rocky isle to connect

romance with the place of the poet's birth; indeed, no known person or name to serve as a nucleus around which may be clustered the various emotions which for so many centuries have been called into being at the mention of the name of Homer. Instead of having been brought down to our age in that beautiful vehicle endeared to us as the bearer of our holy Religion, and the finest elements of our civilization and culture, it was carried to us in the rough gutturals of the gothic North. Instead of having its tones softened by being wafted over that beautiful sheet of water, the Mediterranean, the great conducting medium of antiquity, its original elemental traditions first rang over the frozen clods of Scandinavia, and the Rhine, and Danube, and some perhaps from high and interior Asia.

The materials of this epic are derived from three, perhaps even five distinct periods. 1. The story of Siegfried and Brunhilde is said to belong to a time when the Greeks and Indians had not yet branched off into independent nations, but lived together on the high table-lands of Asia. The story is therefore found with variations in all the branches of the Caucasian race. 2. Another part belongs to the time of Attila, king of the Huns. 3. Another still to that of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths. Some make the stories of Attila, Gunther, and Hagen each belong to a different period; but we find a historical Gunther cotemporaneous with Attila, who fell in a contest with the latter at Basle in Switzerland.* There are portions of this matter, which whether traceable or not, doubtless belongs to still other periods earlier and later.

The subject of the Iliad, as announced in the opening of the poem, is the "Wrath of Achilles," though the announcement involved in the name Iliad is more exact. The achievements of Siegfried form the subject of the Nibelungen poem. The plans of the compilers are different. The reader of the Iliad sees Achilles at the opening of the action, but he retires in sullen anger to his fleet, there lies at his ease and may be imagined to come forth occasionally, view with either scornful or complacent indifference the rage of the doubtful conflict, and inquire somewhat sarcastically how the Greeks are getting along without him, until the poet finally introduces him to close up the drama of the war. This long interval is mostly filled up

* *Vide* Daguet, Histoire de la Confederation Suisse, p. 27.

with narrations of single combats, which have, from the nature of the case, too much sameness to consist with true interest. These incidents might have been indefinitely multiplied or diminished without effect upon the unity of the poem, which is much like that of a division of soldiers in uniform, *a corps d'armeé*, or a brigade, a larger or smaller number would have the same. Such is not the unity of Milton, whose great poem would be affected by the omission of a part much as the human body by the loss of a limb; while an addition would render it very like a body with an additional member.

The Nibelungen Lied, though evidently made up of fragments collected from the four winds, has a different and higher kind of unity. Its hero, Siegfried, is not the first person introduced, but soon appears, and occupies the chief place until he entirely disappears about the middle of the poem. It is indeed a fault to extend a story so far beyond the death of its chief hero; but it is a compensation for this, that the remainder of the poem is but Kriemhilde's attempt to avenge her husband's death.

The European nations became Roman in their literature on receiving Christianity. They looked to Rome for both Christian and classic literature, as Rome had done to Greece. This poem, however, is Gothic, though compiled long after the Germanic nations adopted Christianity. The last compilers drew from pagan sources, Teutonic, Scandinavian, and Slavonic. The stories are of pagan origin. Some of the persons introduced are pagans, as Attila king of the Huns. That which was purely pagan was of course expunged. Hence Woden and Thor and Freya and Walhalla are not there, but the spirit of Gothic or at least Germanic paganism is not extinct in the poem. It is written in Gothic—that is, Old High German—a branch of the language into which Ulphilas translated the Scriptures in the fourth century, which work is the earliest existing monument of German writing. In the days in which Tacitus wrote his little tract on Germany, it was thought that the banks of the Rhine were too cold to produce the grape at all, but now a grape is grown there the juice of which is pronounced by epicures more delicious than any grown on the Mediterranean. Why may not genuine poetic taste, contrary to all the views of past times, expect to find almost as exquisite pleasure in gleanings made from the banks of the Rhine and

Danube, of the remains of early poetry, as in those made so many centuries ago on those of the Ilyssus and the Tiber?

In the twelfth century began the literary revolution which gave us this poem in its present shape. During this transformation, minstrels, (the minnesingers,) some of them of noble birth, rode or wandered on foot through the land, arranging and rearranging according to fancy this material for presentation. While this was transpiring (about 1210) the poem appeared as it now is. The poet was a man of talents and well acquainted with court poetry as then blooming, especially in Austria. He retained the verse-form which he found. It is a stanza of four verses, each divided by a cesura, the first half having three feet with the closing one full, or four with the closing one short; the last half three, and closing with a rhyme, the fourth verse generally having an additional foot, so as to close with a full tone. The plan, binding as it does the rich fullness of its characters and events in smooth simplicity into a strict internal unity, was masterly, far exceeding in its lofty boldness that of the Iliad or Odyssey. But the writer failed somewhat in smelting together the separate songs, and in the details, and so his work remains behind the two Greek poems. Two attempts were made to improve it before the year 1225, one from the St. Gall, the other from the Hohenems* manuscript, now at Munich, and the same which had been used in the original. Soon after this the court poetic art faded as suddenly as it had bloomed, and forever precluded further improvements.

Not many at the present day read Homer in the original, nor very many in translations. He has had his place in literature for more than two thousand years and none wish to displace him. But if the Iliad and the Nibelungen poem had now to make their way to public favor, with no prejudice or presumption on either side, their chances might be more nearly equal. The Greek would doubtless be considered as surpassing the German in the pathos of some few passages, and in general in the majesty of many of its descriptions and the number and aptness of its similitudes, while the German excels in its plan, and most certainly in the perfection of its characters.

There have been many translations of this poem into mod-

* The name of the little town where the manuscript was found. It lies on the Rhine, a few miles above or south-east of Lake Constance.

ern German, of which that of Simrock is confessedly of the first rank. This we have examined, but it is not now before us. The two named at the head of this article we have now in hand. To the criticism and illustration of this poem there have been many contributors, of whom it will suffice to mention the names of Lachmann, Haupt, and one of the brothers Grimm, who have done so much for the clearing up of German antiquity and mythology.

But we must proceed to give the story, with some translations from the poem, for which, however, the poetic talent is wanting. We shall omit the rhyme, but give the sense and preserve the form and measure of the original.

Siegfried is the hero of the poem, Kriemhilde the spotless virgin of his chivalrous pursuit. This maiden, sister of the three kings of Worms on the Rhine, has an innocent dream which she relates to her mother Ute. She dreams of cherishing for many days a wild falcon, which two eagles seize from her in their claws. The mother makes the falcon of the dream a noble husband. His seizure by the eagles shows, indeed, that he is to be killed, unless, as she piously suggests, by way of urging the daughter to marry, God shall interpose a special providence to save him.

Why speakest thou of a husband, O mother, much beloved?
Without the love of cavalier I shall forever be;
So fair shall I remain down to my day of death,
That I of husband's love shall never suffer any need.

And then replied the mother, "Do not so rashly speak;
If in this world thou findest a truly happy lot
It comes from husband's love—a fair wife thou shall be,
If God some noble knight shall on thee kindly yet bestow."

"Let then my word stand fast, dear mother," she replied,
"We see it at a glance, in many a wedded wife,
How love with future sorrow its debt may have to pay;
I will avoid them both," said she, "so shall I never be abused."

In that exalted virtue, she cherished in her heart,
The noble maid did yet live on for many a happy day,
So that she knew of no one, whose love she sighed to win,
But later wedded she a man of knightly, good, and honored birth.

At this point Siegfried, the falcon of the dream, appears in the story. He is the son of Sigmund and Siegelinde, a royal

pair at Xanthen on the lower Rhine. He has grown up to man's estate having developed the noblest virtues of heart, mind, and body. He must receive the honors of knighthood, and in connection with the ceremony, his father institutes a great tournament. Four hundred are to receive knightly honors at the same time. The description brings out many a curious custom. This great cavalcade must proceed ceremoniously to a cloister, where the mass and the knightly instructions and dedication must take place in other style than that of the days of the Knight of Salamanca. The old knights, in order not to lose the amusement of the festival, attend the young ones in the character of servants or squires. The tournament closes the whole, an occasion for the display of skill, taste, and refinement, compared with which the Grecian games were barbarous.

Siegfried has heard of the fame of Kriemhilde's beauty and virtues, and is attracted thither but his father knows the character of her brothers' court at Worms, fears the alliance, uses dissuasions, and proposes another marriage.

Then says the dauntless Siegfried: "O father much beloved,
Without the love of noble dame would I forever be,
Or woo the one for whom in heart I cherished deepest love."
By all that could be said to him, his will remained still firmly set.

"And will thou not desist then?" for so replied the king,
"I too will truly aid thee to carry out thy will;
Will do, to bring this all about, what can be done with right,
Although about king Gunther's court is many a haughty man."

For days the palace at Xanthen is all astir with the preparation. Curious details are given, even to sewing and embroidery. Tears mingle with the toils of servants, as well as in the pastimes of the court circle and the scenes of final partings. Siegfried leaves home with twelve men. He arrives at Worms with seven hundred knights, and all the necessary attendants and sumpter horses of such a train. The sequel will show whence this great array; for this is the key to the whole story. Their arrival without announcement spreads astonishment in the Burgundian palace. Its windows are thickly beset with those whom mingled curiosity and apprehension have drawn thither. The king calls one of his court-

iers—Hagen of Tronje by name, who fills a large place in the narrative—as most likely to identify the newly arrived. He surveys them from a window, declares that this must be Siegfried and his train, and then relates what he has heard of his adventure in the Nibelungen land, which must have transpired years before in order to have become matter of such notoriety. Siegfried had found the Nibelungen people engaged in a strife about the division of their vast treasure. The matter was referred to him. A party dissatisfied with his judgment attacked him, and he having slain their two chiefs—Schilbung and Nibelung—became lord of the people and the entire treasure. He had passed the Nibelungen land on his way and made up his train from these his new subjects. The arrival is thus chronicled:

Upon the seventh morning, with trappings wondrous gay,
These valiant men reached Worms, and rode upon the strand;
Attired in red and gold, from head to foot, they came,
The horses moving gently all led by faithful servants' hands!

The description is minute of each article of the knights' arms and the whole appearance of the train. Hagen, fearing Siegfried's enmity and hoping to share his treasure, advises to receive the party as guests. Brilliant scenes of court life follow, in which tournaments are a main feature. These are occasions for the display of Siegfried's unrivaled strength and skill in arms, as well as beauty, grace, and wealth. The fair Kriemhilde remains, however, unknown to him. It is only as a spectator to the fetes in which he participates that she sees him. But scenes are in preparation which will bring about an impressive meeting between them. Leudiger and Leudegast—the former a Saxon, the latter a Danish prince—send insolent demands to Gunther. But for Siegfried's presence he must have yielded or fought against hope; but this enabled him to return a defiant answer. A bloody field follows. As messengers reach Worms with tidings of victory, Kriemhilde's sympathy in the general joy leads her to admit one to her presence. She learns that among the numbers who have done valiantly, Siegfried's pre-eminence is unquestioned. This makes a way for the first interview, which occurs on the triumphant return of Gunther's forces. Her sight of this knight in the

tournaments had, unconsciously to herself, shaken a little her vow to live single. Now they meet. There is first a public pageant of which a hundred court ladies form a part.

Forth coming from the chamber, the ladies all approach,
There is a mighty rushing of heroes also made;
All with the thought urged onward, if now a chance were come,
To see the noble maiden in gay and festive mood appear.

Now comes the lovely girl, as morning twilight glows
Forth from the somber clouds—so wondrous fair she seems—
Then vanished from his heart his care, so long endured,
He saw the lovely maiden there stand in all her gorgeous state.

There glittered from her raiment full many a precious gem,
And from her rosy features the heart's love also shone;
Had any one wished otherwise, still all must this admit,
That never on this earthly ball a fairer object had appeared.

The personal meeting is thus described:

She saw before her standing the man of noble mind,
His cheeks with modest flushes tinged. The fair girl thus began:
"Welcome here, Herr Siegfried, thou noble knight and good."
He felt from this kind greeting a pleasant glow of heart.

He bent him gently forward, his thanks he then expressed;
Drawn were they toward each other by love which in them burned—
Love mildly beaming in their eyes, as met the mutual glance;
The man's, also the maiden's; by both quite coyly was it done.

If he then kindly kissed her hand—it was of peerless white—
Led by the love which filled his heart, this is to me unknown.
That this would be omitted I do not quite believe,
Two hearts with love fermenting had else not done exactly right.

Summer days are spent walking by her side, exciting the admiration or envy of others, while in the mind of Gunther is germinating a plan of adventure in which he perceives that Siegfried's aid will be needed. In the frozen north is a queen heroine, Brunhilde by name. Every prince who comes to her as a suitor is promised her hand when he shall first have conquered her at tilting, but is to lose his life if beaten. Gunther is disposed to stake his life in this trial. He and Siegfried pledge mutual service, and in a few days they sail down the Rhine with the whole court party for Iceland, whither they

come in eleven days, causing a wonderful gaping from the palace windows of this northern amazon. Introductions are soon over; preliminaries soon arranged. Gunther accepts the terms; but when he and his court see the evidences of Brunhilde's strength and skill as an athlete—though the courtiers freely declare that this illy comports with the softer graces of the feminine character—they become faint-hearted; all except Siegfried. He has among his Nibelungen treasures an article called the tarn cap, possessing the marvelous power to render the wearer invisible. He runs to the ship for this and is not seen to return, but in an unseen form is present and turns the contest in Gunther's favor.

The party returns to Worms, taking Brunhilde and her court along. On their arrival the double marriage is performed, Brunhilde, however, objecting to that of Siegfried and Kriemhilde on the ground of inequality of rank, the former having been introduced to her as her husband's liegeman. This error could not be corrected without revealing the trick by which she had been vanquished. Siegfried and his magic cap must still be brought in once more to aid Gunther in the subjugation of his wife, soon after which he takes his bride home to the Netherlands; and Brunhilde's sore continues to rankle, as he makes no annual return of tribute to her husband. She arranges to invite him and his father's court to Worms. When they arrive, they must open the festive series by going in procession to a monastery to mass. Kriemhilde claims precedence as being of the higher rank; Brunhilde claims it on the ground that Kriemhilde is but the wife of her husband's liegeman. The latter retorts with the fatal hint that Siegfried and not Gunther was the real victor over the proud heroine, thus inflicting a wound too deep to be healed. Explanations make the matter worse. Brunhilde has either been thrown into the hands of another than her real conqueror, or insulted with this intimation. She now begins to plan Siegfried's death. A rumor of the return of the two princes, Leudiger and Leudegast, is circulated; and Siegfried, ready for all hazards, is to share the defense. Hagen, under the guise of friendship, tells Kriemhilde that her husband is rash in exposing himself in battle, and begs her to intrust him with the secret of his vulnerable spot. She tells him that Siegfried

was rendered invulnerable by bathing himself in the blood of a dragon which he had slain.

"While from the dragon's wound the hot blood freely ran,
And in the current bathed himself the knight so bold and good,
There fell upon his back just then an ample linden leaf,
There may he now be wounded, hence feel I anxious care and grief."

Then spoke of Tronje Hagen, "Now if thou wilt but sew
A little sign upon his back that I may surely know
Where I should doubly guard him in battle's raging storm."
So hoped she his dear life to save, but brought him fatal harm.

The rumor is a ruse, and is made the occasion of drawing Siegfried away into a chase. This has its excitements and its weariness. The party rests, and Siegfried asks for wine. None has been brought, but he is told where there is a fountain, to which a run is proposed, and in this Siegfried is ahead, as Hagen designed he should be, and as he stoops to drink, the sign on his back is visible, and Hagen aiming at this pierces him through. The party agree to attribute the death to robbers; but as the body lies in state and is visited by Gunther and Hagen, divine Providence points them out as the murderers by causing the blood to gush anew from the wound as they enter.

Then follow thirteen years of mourning, spent in visiting the tomb of the departed, building a monastery, and in patiently waiting an opportunity of avenging the murder. During this time the fabulous treasure of the Nibelungen, which now fell to Kriemhilde, is by advice of her two brothers, Eiselher and Gerenot, transported to Worms. This consists of nothing but gold and precious stones, and twelve heavy wagons, making three trips by day and three by night, were occupied four days in transporting it to the river for shipment.

Hagen saw the growth of Kriemhilde's influence by the possession of this treasure, and tried in vain to arouse the fears of her royal brother. He managed finally to get possession of it himself, but was obliged to save it by sinking it in the Rhine.

Thirteen years after the death of Siegfried an embassy arrives from Etzel (Attila, king of the Huns) to ask Kriem-

hilde's hand in marriage. He is a pagan, she a Christian, and this has caused him, as it does her, to hesitate; but she sees in this offer the star of hope that God is about to place vengeance in her power. Hagen has misgivings, but the royal brothers advise acceptance and she goes with the embassy.

At the end of another thirteen years the court of Worms are invited to visit that of Attila at Gran. Hagen's diplomatic eye discerns in this a plot, but he fears the imputation of timidity, and concurs in the acceptance of the invitation. The action from this point occupies about twenty-five days and about half the poem. It is full of adventure, the last two days all tragic. In this part is pictured the preparation of sixty tried heroes, one thousand knights, and nine thousand servants, with the necessary sumpter horses. They cross the Rhine on boats at Worms. In twelve days they reach the Danube at a place called Moering. The swollen river would have forbidden the passage of a company of less enterprise. But Hagen goes in quest of the means of crossing. He finds the clothes of two nymphs who were bathing in the stream. These he holds, in order to force from the owners the information which he needs. They tell him that the keeper of the ferry, Else by name, is morose and too rich to serve them for pay, but will come if they announce to him a certain name. They then receive back their clothes, and volunteer the prediction that of this vast train from Burgundy only the chaplain will ever again see the Rhine.

Hagen calls as directed, and the crabbed ferryman comes; but finding himself cheated, his natural gruffness explodes into a rage. He fears that he may be admitting a hostile force into his master's land, raises his heavy oar against Hagen, and the latter severs his head from his body and casts the parts into the stream, and is left to guide the huge craft alone through the swollen waters. He breaks an oar, is carried far out of his course, but succeeds in reaching the party and transporting all safely over the river.

Hagen puts on an air of contempt of the nymphs' prediction, but his haughty soul is full of superstition. He fears and attempts to reverse the destiny announced so that the chaplain alone of all the host shall fail of a return to the banks of the Rhine, and so contrives to quarrel with him, and

throw him overboard. The latter swims ashore, and, alarmed for his safety, returns to Worms on foot, and thus Hagen's attempt to defeat is turned into a means of fulfilling the prophecy.

The report of Else's death is already spread. The Bavarian margrave, Gelfrat, gathers his chevaliers, seven hundred in number, and pursues the invading strangers. It is night; and afraid to encamp, they continue their journey by moonlight, and are overtaken by their pursuers.

They halted in their movement, for so they needs must do;
They saw how in the darkness the burnished armor shone, etc.

A battle closes this scene, costing the parties about one hundred on each side; the pursuers return, and the Nibelungen people reach Passan, on the borders of Austria and Bavaria, then and now the seat of a Christian bishop, who receives them kindly.

The next stage is the most pleasant of the story, fit contrast to the tragedy which is to follow. They seem to pass immediately from Passan into the territory of the Margrave Rudiger of Bechlaren, Attila's embassador to Worms to seek the hand of Kriemhilde. Their approach is announced to him, and he meets and escorts them. The ladies of his household have been instructed how to receive the guests, and are prepared. The wife and daughter are to kiss the six men of highest rank. With this they get along very well, with a single exception, as seen in the following:

The countess kissed the kings all three, so did the daughter too;
To Hagen she must do the same, for he stood also there;
Her father bade her kiss him—she cast at him a glance,
He looked to her so frightful, she greatly sighed to pass him by.

In this connection convivial and social court life is beautifully portrayed. The guests would have remained only over night, fearful that they might eat their host out of house and home; but the latter bids them feel no concern on that score, should they choose to remain fourteen days. They did remain seven days; a marriage contract is concluded between Eiselher and Rudiger's daughter; each guest receives on leav-

ing a present from both host and hostess. Rudiger with his chivalry accompanies them all the way to Gran, Attila's capital, and there dies reluctantly fighting against his late guests for Attila and Kriemhilde.

On their arrival they find also Theodoric of Verona, with five hundred knights a guest with Attila. He has the kindness to warn Hagen of his danger, and the latter has the impudence to refuse all respect to Kriemhilde, even to that of rising in her presence. Her plan was to have him assassinated the first night; but the warning places him on his guard. The next day in the great dining hall the pent-up fires of Hagen's rage burst forth into a flame, and he strikes off the head of his host's little boy as he is borne by his teacher through the hall. The tragedy is now opened. Hagen and his brother Volker take possession of a door at the head of a flight of stairs and hold it till the next day. The whole party from Worms is exterminated. Theodoric and his old courtier, Hildebrand, alone survive of his company. Rudiger and his party become extinct. Last of all, Kriemhilde is also slain. Theodoric and Hildebrand deliver to her, wounded and bound, Hagen and her brother Gunther. Hagen pleads for life, and she promises it on the condition that he shall tell the place of the hidden treasure. He declines, on the ground that he has pledged himself not to do this while any one of the three kings live, of whom Gunther alone survives. She hastens to remove this obstacle, which Hagen hoped that fraternal feeling would have prevented, but he still refuses to make the revelation and is slain. The popular feeling has gone mainly with Kriemhilde until this final act, but her excitement has become such that she cannot stop, and the old Hildebrand, indignant at seeing revenge thus carried beyond all reason, slays her, and here the tragedy and the poem end.

In the Royal palace at Munich are two series of frescoes representing the principal scenes of two great epics, the Nibelungen poem and the Odyssey* of Homer. The former is by Professor von Schnor; the latter was designed by Schwanthaler and executed by Hiltensperger. The former is contained in a

* The Odyssey series is not properly fresco, but encaustic. The distinction does not enter into our purpose.

series of four rooms, each about thirty-six feet square. These rooms have no purpose but to show the paintings, and are without an article of furniture. The visitors find themselves in no society but that of each other and the persons of the poem in the court circle of an age of the distant past.

The first room contains the chief figures of the entire poem grouped in some one of their more prominent relations. Engravings of two of these now hang before us. They are those of the two bridal pairs, Siegfried and Kriemhilde, and Gunther and Brunhilde, the one setting forth a happy, the other an unhappy marriage, and were the annual gift of the Munich Art Union for 1860. In the latter Gunther is grasping the wrist of his bride, showing a disposition to caress her, with a peculiar expression of mortification at her utter want of sympathy; while her face is averted, her brow wrinkled, her lip curled, the muscles of her Amazon arm distended and showing the tendons as if in resistance, and stung to the quick at the thought of having been brought into this position by another conquest than that of mutual love. In the other group stands Siegfried and Kriemhilde side by side, she leaning her head upon his shoulder, with every muscle relaxed, as though just where she would be and quite indisposed to change her place; while he stands erect, his countenance illuminated with the proud consciousness of having achieved a conquest to him far more pleasant than all his mighty deeds of arms. By an agreeable anachronism the falcon of her dream is proudly perched upon Kriemhilde's shoulder.

The second room represents the leading events of Siegfried's life, but takes its name and the general character of its adornings from the crowning event, and is called the "Marriage Hall —*Saal der Hochzeit.*" The chief points in the next room are the chase, the death of Siegfried, the deadly missile of Hagen piercing his back as he stoops to drink from a fountain, the body lying in state and the blood spirting anew from its wound as Gunther and Hagen enter. It is called the "Hall of Betrayal—*Saal des Verraths.*" In the fourth room we have the slaughter of the heroes in the palace of Attila, a part of the palace in flames. This is called the "Hall of Vengeance—*Saal der Rache.*" Some guide-books speak of a fifth room called the "Hall of Lamentation—*Saal der Klage.*" This

belongs indeed to the design, but is not yet painted; Professor Schnor, as it is said, having so injured his sight that he cannot proceed with his work. This is founded upon an appendix to the poem called the "Klage," relating the burial of the slain and the sending home of their weapons and effects under the direction of Theodoric. This appendix contains four thousand five hundred lines. It is half as long as the main poem. We have made this reference to the designed painting as a gentle caution to those tourists who write about sights they saw without having seen them.

The Odyssey series is contained in four halls much larger than those of the Nibelungen paintings. These are light, airy, and agile, nimbly or gracefully moving or as gracefully at rest, and make the visitor feel himself truly in the society of the fabulous persons of the Odyssey. They are in relation to the Gothic figures of the other series as the Greek to the Goth, as anything Grecian to anything of the same kind Gothic.

Shall we ever see the day when walls many times as large as those hung by the most extensive picture gallery in our land shall present to our eyes the figures of some single great epic? To Americans in their own land that day is as distant as is the establishment of royalty and thrones and palaces and courts. Should the Southern Confederacy realize its dream of Independence, its hope of this gratification might be nearer than ours. Its government subverted and a sprig of royalty in its place, it might soon have palaces and paintings, but its common people might suffer as much as they do even now from want of intelligence and bread.

All nations have indeed possessed the materials of such epics, but none except the Greeks and Germans have so fully collected and shaped them into that form. An attempt during the last century to collect the poems of Ossian, ended, as is generally thought, in one of the most magnificent jokes of the age. It was, as Von der Hagen says of some plans for improving the Nibelungen poem, an "Ilias post Homerum." The Iliad is doubtless a collection of so much of the ballad poetry or short epics of the heroic age of Greece as could well be made to form one whole. The Nibelungen Lied bears the same relation to the Gothic or Germanic ballads of the Minnesingers. The poetry of the Troubadours wanted the poet or

the favoring circumstances, and not the matter of such a work. So of the Spanish ballads.

The German poem lies within, the Greek far without, the cycle of history. We can trace the stories which enter into it, some to a historical, others to a mythical origin outside of the poem itself. In the other case history does not determine whether the popular traditions came from the poem, or the poem from the traditions; whether the legends of all the past were collected to form the Iliad, or whether all the parts belonged together from the start; whether the siege of Troy is partially or wholly a piece of the poet's patchwork, or whether an actual siege supplied the whole material of the poem; whether the Iliad was originally one poem, or many separate ones finally moulded by some genius into one. On these questions the analogy of the Nibelungen poem has its value.

The Homeric poems are to be studied as a picture of the manners, customs, and arts of an age—but of what age? That of the siege of Troy, or one three or four centuries later, or still some other earlier or later period, or a mixture of all? Could the manners, customs, and arts of the Iliad ever have coexisted in real life? Perhaps the poet used what tradition had saved from the age of the events described, and pieced it out with conjectures and with fragments of his own age and intervening ones. The Paradise Lost improved landscape gardening in England by its pictures drawn in advance of anything real. So perhaps the Homeric poems are ahead of history. As presenting the picture of an age, the Nibelungen poem will help us less in regard to Homer. It may perhaps draw its own materials from several ages, from that of Gunther, Theodoric, or Attila down to that of the final compiler. But some age or ages it does picture with great simplicity and distinctness. Social manners and customs, especially those of court life, war, the chase, the tournament, costumes, equipages, etiquette, trappings, caparisons, and convivial entertainments, are all made in this poem the subject of minute and graphic delineations, and all in the spirit of the Goths, Burgundians, and other Germanic tribes.

We can trace the progressive growth of the Nibelungen poem from its inception in the popular ballads to its culmina-

tion in a grand epic. How is it in case of the Homeric poems? Grote fixes the siege of Troy at 1150 B. C., the composition of the Iliad at about 850 B. C., leaving an interval of more than three hundred years between the supposed time of the events and that of the poem, while the origin of written language he makes some two hundred years still later. The same writer supposes the Iliad to have been completed before the age of Pisistratus, while some think that the final compilation was made by order of that magistrate about 550 B. C. On any supposition, here is a broad land of shadows which each man may enter to glean, and have the satisfaction of feeling that his gleanings derive most of their coloring and substance from the subjective processes of his own mind. What were the elementary forms of these poems we may never know, but we cannot conceive of the earliest efforts at composition as being extended. The stimulus is wanting to the necessary exertion. There could be no rivalry strong enough to prompt it. This must be a slow and gradual process, which in its progress would generate the material for some master mind of a coming age to seize upon, develop, and refine into the perfect and extended work. True, the absence of written compositions and other influences which divide the mind of our age may have favored the Greek epics. The plot of the Iliad did not call for genius. In this respect it falls below the Eneid or the Nibelungen Lied, far below the Paradise Lost. It is a simple narrative of great beauty. As answering the demands of a perfect ear for poetic numbers, it has no rival among epics. A nation with an ear fine by nature, left for centuries with a beautiful language addressed only to the ear, its poetical productions handed down through generations of men, embracing the genius and taste of the nation, trained as their only work to recite them in public, their language being the finest and most flexible the world ever saw, there could have concurred no more favorable circumstances for developing such a work as the Iliad. Not reduced to writing it could not pass through ten, fifteen, or twenty generations of reciters without receiving those changes of which the genius of the nation was capable.

The greatest difference in the circumstances producing the two poems was the change of religion in the one case. The

Greek nation developed itself under the influence of the original Polytheistic system. No violent change was wrought in their mythology or religion from its inception until long after the culmination of its development. In the time of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, the system, though disbelieved by many, was but the natural growth of that which saw the dawn of the nation, much less was there any change brought in before the Homeric poems were complete. The polytheism of the German might have furnished an equal amount of material to adorn an epic had such poem been composed before the system was superseded by Christianity. We have learned comparatively little of German paganism; and if the Greek system had been superseded by a power so mighty as Christianity before it became crystalized in the Homeric poems, we should have had but the faintest traces of its existence, and the Iliad, if ever produced, would have been shorn of half its power. The monotheism of the Bible and its growth into Christianity is indeed more sublime, but it has only the sublimity of a distinct idea and a simple unity which withers as a blast all the foliage and flowers with which polytheism could have adorned an epic. Milton has indeed gained and held the highest summit of the sublime, but he has done this by breathing upon the dry bones of an extinct polytheism, and restoring them to a transient life, as Homer had used them when a living system. The same is true of all the systems of Western Europe except that of Rome; they became extinct before literature had taken their full and distinct impression, and yet we know enough of the Germanic system to conceive how its loss may have stinted the growth of its future epics. We have little of Walhalla compared with Homer's full and glowing accounts of the councils of the gods in cloud-capped Ida and Olympus, and yet we have enough to aid our conceptions as to what it might have been if developed in a great epic. The attributes of the gods of the North, while they fall not below those of the Greeks in heroism, have a mildness toward mortals, and a moral beauty unknown in Greek mythology. Freya is the Goddess of Love; her eye is an eternal spring; her neck and cheeks are light; she is a friend of sweet song, and loves to hear the prayers of mortals! Heimdall is the watchman of the gods, stationed at Heaven's bridge,

that is, the rainbow; has an eye so sharp as to see five hundred miles, and by night as by day; and an ear so keen as to hear the grass grow in the fields and the wool on the lambs' backs. Such fragments now collected in the northern Eddas were excluded by the rise of Christianity. It is true that the elements of the pagan theology falling into the ground sprung up in an abundant growth of legends of saints and knightly heroes, but they never filled the chasm which had been left for them. Infidels despise them as being a part of Christianity, many believers as fungi deforming its otherwise beautiful exterior while he who unites the true Christian with the true philosopher views these things as indifferent to Christianity, but as marking a most interesting step in the development of the race. But although these legends occupy the place and keep up the very spirit of the ancient mythology in the minds of the common Germans, they cannot rise in our minds to the dignity of the similar stories of the pagan system—they are too trifling to be received into Christian society as belonging to it, and too near related to be received as foreign guests.

Grote hits very well the characters of the Nibelungen Lied as compared with those of Homer. "Though the Grecian freeman of the heroic age is above the degraded level of the Gallic plebes, as described by Cesar, he is far from rivaling the fierce independence and sense of dignity combined with individual force, which characterize the German tribes before their establishment in the Roman empire."* The great hero of the Greeks, Achilles, as seen in the very opening of the Iliad, is haughty and revengeful, submits in sullen silence to his chief, but retires cherishing thoughts of vengeance. Agamemnon is no better—resorts to a trick in the assembly involving the gods with him. Nestor rises indeed above this level, but still is privy to Agamemnon's artifice. Ulysses carries out his part of the plot by smiting the common people with his scepter, treating even the princes little better, beating Thersites upon the back so as to raise great welks, because he alone had dared to speak upon the other side of the question in debate. This shows a character perfectly servile in the people. Hector's last interview with Andromache presents indeed some of the noblest traits of human character, which shine

* History of Greece, vol. ii, p. 78.

the more brightly from their solitude; but the heroes of the poem are throughout haughty, revengeful, and false, in this last respect showing themselves worthy ancestors of the modern Greeks.

On the contrary, Siegfried is one of the noblest and most beautiful characters ever drawn. Kriemhilde is an instance of supreme devotion to a husband. This controls her life even for twenty-six years after her first husband's death. The pious acts of her widowhood, her marriage to Attila in order to avenge Siegfried's murder, and desire for revenge, which she cherishes with great moderation at first, but finally allows it to transcend all bounds, are but the proofs of her devotion to Siegfried. More beautiful domestic scenes are rare in palace or cottage than those in the account of Siegfried at home with his parents, Sigmund and Siegelinde.

It is the province of genius to form imperishable creations. The march of history may disprove the facts of such works, that of science may overthrow their philosophical or other theories, the progress of language may make them to modern readers somewhat like the fashions of the Dutch burghers of New Amsterdam in a New York drawing-room of to-day; but their life is still untouched. We might read all the English history extant, and the persons of Shakspeare's historical plays would remain in our minds the living embodiment of English history, so far as they go. The theology which Bunyan has made incarnate in Christian and his fellow-pilgrims is that which will live in our minds and hearts in spite of all didactic treatises. All the classic dictionaries in the world are without power to dissolve the heroes crystalized in our minds by the Iliad. And so the heroes of the Nibelungen Lied, Siegfried and Kriemhilde, Gunther and Brunhilde, Sigmund and Rudiger, and even Hildebrand, Attila, and Theodoric, though but slightly touched in the poem, will continue to visit our thoughts as conceived by the poet of the Nibelungen Lied and painted by Schnor, nor will any amount of reading on the subject greatly modify the images with their equipages and costumes connected with the court and convivial life, the chase, the tournament, the battle, and the domestic scenes of the time, as found in this work. The moral question how far the mind ought to be thus permanently peopled with images

drawn from the mythology, legends, and improbable traditions of early and barbarous ages, we shall not discuss. Suffice it to say, that time is better spent in the view of living pictures of the distant past, than in obtaining fictitious and distorted ones of our own age, making ourselves, our neighbors and friends much better or worse than the truth. Why have not our great American poets, our Bryants and Longfellows, gleaned more in the field of the middle age epic?

Art. VI.—KIDDER'S HOMILETICS.

A Treatise on Homiletics: Designed to Illustrate the true Theory and Practice of Preaching the Gospel. By Daniel P. Kidder, D.D., Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute. 12mo., pp. 495. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

The public were advertised in advance of the appearance of Dr. Kidder's work, and though under other circumstances we should have received the announcement with but the common approval due to a good and generous undertaking—there being a goodly number of excellent works on this subject—yet in this we felt a lively interest. It is fit that at this time the attention of the Churches should be called to the sphere and dignity of the pulpit, destined as it is to a mission and power it has never yet achieved, and charged with an augmenting responsibility as the progress of the world and the foregleamings of Providence betoken a new era of evangelism. Besides, the subject of Homiletics has been by no means exhausted, and the suggestions of each age should be added to the previous stores, while the appearance from time to time of such works as the one before us is a timely admonition to the ministry of the claims and high functions of the sacred office. We further hail this work with a welcome as being the first of its kind issued from the Arminian press written from the Arminian stand-point. For preaching has not only a general character to maintain for sound eloquence and evangelism, but does of natural consequence also take on a denominational complexion

according to the genius of the theological system, and the ecclesiasticism which give it germ and scope and nourishment. And while we thankfully concede the general elevation and power, and the high national traits of American sacred oratory, and the growing excellences that have distinguished our sister Churches especially for the last fifty years, we may be pardoned for a traditional prejudice, which has ripened into personal judgment and conviction in our maturer observation, in favor of the freedom and oratorical vantage-ground of the Methodist pulpit. We were the more anxious, therefore, that a work should be put in the hands of our young ministers which, while it increased their mental discipline and oratorical culture and enlarged their views of this function of the sacred office, should also preserve the spirit of the olden times—"there were giants in those days"—which made preaching a glory to the Church and a terror to the hosts of the enemy. Culture and unction must go together. The laws of motion are of no value without the propelling power of motion. The pulpit must have learning, and skill, and the discipline of art, but above all it must have the meekness and gentleness of Christ, and the baptism of fire by the Holy Ghost. The modern revival of pure evangelism, which dates with the Wesleyan era, has given a new type to preaching, unknown in the Christian Church hitherto, unknown even in the post-apostolic age; and this regenerated form of preaching, which is not grafted upon the old systems of classical rhetoric, but springs from the joint ideas of "the Church and culture," freshened and invigorated by the Holy Ghost, we would jealously preserve.

The value of the science of homiletics can be estimated only by giving to preaching its due relative position among the means of grace. Two theories respecting Church instrumentality have chiefly obtained since the apostles' days. They relate to the comparative claims and relative offices of preaching and the sacraments. Early in the history of the Church a hierarchal tendency discovered itself, and the theocratic idea of the Mosaic law and priesthood was transferred to the Christian ministry. After this original they modeled without stint or abatement, till the theory of a hierarchy finally culminated in a spiritual autocracy, an earthly headship, the papacy. With the growth of these principles came the superstitious ven-

eration of the sacraments, and the cumbrous and often absurd rituals of the papal Church. The leading feature of this theory of grace and Church instrumentality is, that all grace flows to the recipient from Christ the fountain through the channel of the sacraments, by the administration of a priesthood divinely appointed, and lineally connected with Christ through the apostles. The idea we here intend is sufficiently expressed by the Oxford Tractarians. "The sacraments," say they, "not preaching, are the sources of divine grace; the apostolic ministry has a virtue in it which goes out over the whole Church when sought by the prayer of faith." Such a theory places the sacraments in the foreground of Church instrumentality, and gives to preaching but a subordinate place. Like the Hebrew ceremonials, it is adapted to a stationary, not a proselytic and rapidly expansive Church.

Not so the New Testament. Its mission is not symbolized by a priest standing at his altar, but by a herald rather, "flying through the midst of heaven, and having the everlasting Gospel to preach to all nations." The sacraments were given to those who are saved, to bring them together and build them up in one fellowship. So also is preaching appointed "for the edifying of the body of Christ." But the sacraments have no aggressive mission, like preaching, to perform. They have their place in the bosom of the Church as the blessed mysteries of our holy religion, the symbols and pledges of dying love and renewing grace, while preaching is not only an organic activity for Church edification, but the leading instrument for Church enlargement over the world. No theory of Church which thrusts preaching into the background, or makes it, as in the medieval ages, but a decent addendum to a pompous round of ceremonials, can justify itself by New Testament authority. The multiplication of treatises like the one before us shows that the Church is awake to the true spirit and grandeur of her commission. A work on homiletics would have made but a sorry figure among the Jewish rituals.

The work before us takes a broad and enlightened view of its subject, and rescues homiletics from the subordinate position to which it has been assigned by an inordinate ritualism on the one hand, or the secularizing tendencies of a scholastic theology on the other. Anciently and generally through the

middle ages, it rested on the basis of classical rhetoric. The development of Christian rhetoric from the pastoral, or as it has been called, the "Christian and churchly life principle," had not been made. The sermon, as a production of Christian rhetoric developed from the Church-life relation, has been the slow growth of centuries. The sermon has a history of its own, a science of its own, a sphere and destiny all its own. What could heathenism propose as an aim of oratory, and an object of eloquence, to be compared with the salvation of the soul? The themes, the ends, the sources of Revelation were infinitely above the conceptions of the most enlightened of the heathen nations. The character of God, the grandeur of the moral government, the mysteries of redemption, the glories of heaven, the terrors of hell, the certainties of spiritual and eternal things, the responsibilities of human beings under the noon-day light of these revelations of the world to come, all conspired to elevate Christian oratory above all conception of Grecian or Roman models. It is too sacred, too sublime, to be fashioned in their schools. The Church has been long, culpably long, in disenthralling the pulpit from the toils of the heathen masters of rhetoric and the manners of the theater; but at last the living principle of Christianity has herein individualized itself, and subordinated true science and philosophy to its own uses, and presented to the world Homiletics as a Christian science. Our author justly regards Homiletics "not as a branch or species of rhetoric," but "a higher science, to which rhetoric, logic, and other systems of human knowledge are tributary." The pulpit is not identical with the platform, the forum, the floor of deliberative debate, or the lecture room. It has a sphere of its own, and a type of eloquence and oratory not shared in common by any other species of address. Homiletics, indeed, is a generic term. "It comprehends not only the sermon, but also those various other forms and styles of religious discourse which have been publicly practiced and recognized at different periods of the history of the Church, such as exhortations, homilies, postils, and platform addresses."—P. 94. But of these the sermon is the characteristic and standard work of the Christian minister. "To this work he needs to devote his constant study and his diligent labor, his profoundest meditation and his most fervent prayers, that he may

show himself 'approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word.'"—P. 111.—The postil, indeed, is superseded; it belonged to the dark ages, when preaching was little else than a supplement to give decency and character to ceremonial worship. "The postil sustained a relation to the mass analogous to that of a postscript to a letter." The homily is too familiar and hortatory in its character to be suited to all the ends of preaching. The exhortation, a most important and indispensable part of homiletic address, is yet too free and persuasive to admit the didactic and dialectic elements of the sermon. The same may be said of the platform address, which admits of "greater freedom of manner and variety of matter than the sermon, while it demands less of thorough discussion and systematic arrangement." But it is the sermon which is "the representative product of homiletics."

It is an admirable feature of this work that it considers the homiletical functions of the minister in connection with the multiplied and expanded agencies of the modern Church. The activity of Christian benevolence has opened new fields for Christian oratory. Aside from the regular Sabbath services, and from the common liabilities of demand in all ages for "funerals, special providences, and festive occasions," we now reckon the claims of temperance, missions, Sunday-schools, education, and multiplied public charities. These are not occasional, but uniform. They are part of the organic life of the Church. The platform has hence become second only to the pulpit for the advocacy of truth and benevolence, and as the theater of sacred eloquence. Preaching to children our author brings under a distinct head in his "classification of sermons." It is expected of the minister of the Gospel in this day that he will be the advocate of all humane, religious, and educational enterprises, and Dr. Kidder has done well in thus setting the standard before the aspirant to the sacred office.

A treatise on homiletics should not only lay down those fundamental principles on which the science rests, but trace its connection also with the history and life of the Church. Preaching has a history as well as a philosophy, and it is that history which supplies us with the circumstances of its growth or decline through the successive ages of the Church. The

homiletical functions of the ministry stand organically connected with Church life, and in their artistic form, with the general culture of the ages also. The history of the sermon as to its exterior and human features, like all history, is not merely a given number of facts chronologically or serially arranged, but a genetic development from a seed planting disclosing alike the wisdom and folly of the ages, their fidelity and corruption, as to the grand genius and intent of the New Testament Church.

In the apostolic age preaching became a power that already shook the world. Through the patristic ages, as heathen learning and philosophy appeared in the Church, preaching became more conformed to the schools, with a corresponding loss of spiritual simplicity and evangelical purity. As the Church increased in wealth, secularity, and formalism, the power of Christian oratory declined, and the former part of the medieval period made no improvements in this direction, while the latter part developed the pulpit only in the direction of the scholastic philosophy. The Reformation of the sixteenth century awoke the genius of the pulpit, and preaching has always flourished under the revival of pure religion and true science. Modern homiletics must not ignore the admonitory lessons of the past. In estimating what a sermon should now be, we must take into account the experience of the Christian ages. The history of a science indicates the laws of its natural unfolding and growth according to fundamental principles. Each science, too, has its relative sphere in the cyclopedia of sciences; and while it has a legitimate sphere of its own, its points of connection and correlation with other branches, according to a true and philosophic Methodology, should be pointed out. In all these respects the work before us is more ample and satisfactory than any of its predecessors which have fallen under our eye. The demands of the student are sufficiently met, and the tyro here finds an ample historic and scientific unfolding of the subject brought down to the wants of the modern pulpit. The work is a thesaurus of facts and principles, in which the author shows himself a skillful teacher, always practical, perspicuous, and judicious, never losing sight of his pupil, and supplying an analysis which leaves nothing to be desired beyond.

Preaching is distinctively a New Testament institution. It was but imperfectly developed in the Levitical and prophetic offices of the Old Testament, and Isaiah's chief allusions to it "are prophetic of the Saviour and his mission." John Baptist exceeded the highest models of the old dispensation, but was only the forerunner of the great Preacher. "Never man spake like this man," and he ordained preaching as the characteristic method of extending his kingdom. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," was the statute of institution. Private and public speech, even rhetoric and oratory, had been in the world anterior to this, but nothing like the institution of preaching. "Judicial, deliberative, and forensic eloquence had been highly cultivated at Greece and Rome, and also philosophic teaching; but the former were confined to tribunes, senates, and forums, and the latter to academic shades. Here was a new and broader field opened for eloquence. Preaching was appointed for the world, and preachers were made debtors of the Gospel to every human being, whether Jew or Gentile, high or low, rich or poor, bond or free."—Pp. 26–28. And this divine method of persuasion has vanquished the ridicule and contempt of the wise and great of this world, (1 Cor. i, 18–28,) and outlived all others. "Since the days of Christ the forums of Greece and Rome have perished, and the systems of their wisest philosophers have passed away; but the preaching of the Gospel has continued, and so multiplied itself that it more nearly fills the world than any system of teaching or of influencing mankind has ever done. And still this great function of the Christian ministry has a world-wide field open before it, demanding its increased and most efficient exercise."—P. 28.

The sermon being the chief exponent of the grand commission, must have a specific character and a legitimate sphere. The pulpit is Christ's organ, to be used only under his instructions, and for the ends of his Gospel. The preacher here has no discretion. He must use his profession for the purposes of his commission or resign it. But while the pulpit has a professional mission to fulfill, it has also a relation to the age and to the state of general letters and philosophy. In other words, the sermon must always have a literary as well as an evangelical character. By a self-regulating law of society the sermon

must furnish a fair index of the general culture of the age, and a still more accurate gauge of the intellectual and moral condition of the Church. The average style of preaching must correlate, as a general law, with the prevailing type of mind in the congregations, with this difference, that as the pulpit is a public educator indirectly in general knowledge, and directly in ethics and religion, the preacher is supposed to stand upon a plane above the common level, to lift his auditors into new states of intellectual and moral life. Preaching, with all the advance of modern times, has not yet, even in Protestant lands, perfectly developed, much less exhausted the original idea of its great Institutor. Both in "the letter" and in "the spirit," in evangelical material, intellectual structure, and unction, the Protestant pulpit has yet much to achieve.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has a glorious record. For unction, for skill in the word of God, for adaptation to their times, for devotion to their work, her champions of other days are high examples, but they are not in every sense models for us. No one age is an absolute standard for another. Our variation from them respects the form, not the substance; the manner, not the matter; the accidental, not the essential qualities. By her recent act for extending the time of ministerial service, the Methodist Episcopal Church has taken an important step in its bearings on the pulpit. If the rule in question becomes generally an operative law and not a dead letter of her economy, its natural effect will be to induce habits of greater precision of thought and style, variety and depth of matter, and a more scientific structure of the sermon. If this can be done with an increase of spiritual power and unction, it will prove an unexampled blessing to the Church.

So long as the sermon is the joint product of the divine and human mind, of the co-working of the divine and human agency, that part which is submitted to the responsibility of the human agent must be regarded as one of the highest trusts ever committed to mortals. Nothing here is too small to be worthy of notice, nothing is unworthy of careful study. The subject-matter and the "unction from the Holy One" are supplied from above; all else must rest with the responsibility of the human embassador. Even the right understanding of

the message, and the moral conditions on which the Holy Spirit's aid is secured, are parts of the awful trust of the ministry. With it rests the responsibility of the entire business of explaining, illustrating, defending, and enforcing truth, with all the circumstances and accidents attending the acceptable and effectual *delivery* of the message.

'Tis not a cause of small import
The pastor's care demands;
But what might fill an angel's heart,
And filled a Saviour's hands.

When we speak of what may be called the human part of the sermon, we may consider it in two respects: in its interior and intellectual structure, and in its exterior and sensible delivery. The latter may be considered the inferior or secondary part, but not on that account to be neglected. It is this which always strikes the senses in advance of thought. We speak of the sounds of the voice, and the attitudes, gestures, and manners of the speaker. The ear takes in the sound and the eye surveys and scans the speaker, and, through both these channels, impressions favorable or unfavorable are made. It is exactly this part of the sermon which marks the difference between a message delivered in writing and one delivered by a living speaker. All the advantages, so far as preaching is concerned, which Infinite Wisdom contemplated in the call and appointment of a living ministry, as distinct from a written message to our world, are comprehended in that part of the sermon submitted to the responsibility of the preacher, of which the exterior and sensible part is a large proportion. These ocular and audible exhibitions of the speaker are the subjects of constant though often unconscious criticism, and however unimportant they may be considered, relatively to the thought and substance of the discourse, and however the speaker may affect indifference, or even contempt, for the judgments which may be passed upon them, they nevertheless have the effect to awaken agreeable or disagreeable emotions, to please or to offend, to add to or detract from the emphasis and effect of the thought, and hence to facilitate or retard the ends of the sermon. Causes of such potency no orator can afford to treat with indifference. Thought and feeling stand

intimately related in the speaker to vocal sound and oratorical action, but it is a grievous error to suppose that nature will indicate the appropriate laws of sound and action. This is the office of science. In speaking, the voice and action conform to habit, and the only question is, whether habit shall be settled and disciplined by scientific laws, founded on natural fitness and propriety, or left to chance. It is a sad error to suppose that culture here is against nature. The varied powers of the human voice and the proprieties of pulpit manner are no more the product of nature, independent of culture, than is a correct judgment, an enlightened understanding, a healthful conscience, or a knowledge of house architecture. It is cultivated nature for which we plead. The exterior, artistic, and automatic part of oratory should be so studied and familiarized as to become part of the natural self of the speaker. It should never be exhibited on its own account, nor give any sign that it is the work of culture and art, but spring spontaneously from the necessities of the thought and feeling of the speaker. It should never attract attention to itself, but simply serve for the easy and unobstructed transmission of the thought and feeling of the speaker to the mind and heart of the hearer. It should be like the outgrowth and organism of a healthful plant, such as to give free scope and accurate form to the working of the inner principle of life, without defect or malformation. It is the business of the preacher to transfer his subject with all its accompaniment of motive power to the hearers, and to do it without abatement of the effect intended is the object of his profession. The *sensible* or *apparent* part of the sermon is simply the machinery by which he would lodge in the hearts of the hearers what is already conceived and felt in his own. "Pulpit elocution," says our author, "is to be regarded as the executive branch of homiletics. It is the divinely appointed channel of communication between a preacher and his hearers. By means of a good delivery the preacher may apply the results of his own studies and the full power of Gospel truth to the hearts and consciences of men. For lack of it the best preparation may be rendered nugatory, and the Gospel itself a subject of scoffing and reproach."—P. 331.

Can a subject of such moment to the destiny of the pulpit be innocently neglected? The vocal powers are as suscepti-

ble of culture as the voluntary muscles, and no excuse for their neglect is admissible, except for such organic defect as should exclude a man from the pulpit. It is not a mere book training that we insist upon, but a practical discipline. We can never acquire a sailor's chest and hardiness by reading books on nautical science, nor the muscle of a blacksmith's arm by studying the theory of a horse-shoe, nor can the human voice be developed simply by studying text-books on elocution. Practice is necessary. The voice must be developed and disciplined. The organs of voice must be studied anatomically, and also the muscles which are brought into exercise in speaking. The sounds of the English language in their elemental and combined relations must be exploded with ease and accuracy. Words must be analyzed according to phonographic orthography. The theory of loud speaking, of the deep orotund voice, of perspective sound, of the grave undertone, of the circumflex, emphasis, modulation, inflection, and the varied movements of the voice as representing the passions and emotions, narrative and colloquial style, all must be made familiar as a second nature. To be able to develop the sounds of our language, to represent thought and feeling and character by the voice with ease and naturalness, is the perfection of this department of English oratory.

The training of all the physical powers with reference to general health is no less necessary than this special attention to the vocal organs. We say with the author: "The practice of vocal music, of reading aloud, of declaiming to woods and shores, of gesticulating with the ax, saw, or hoe, and any other means of economizing time and utilizing energy, may be profitable if intelligently directed to the attainment of the objects now recommended."—P. 338. The same attention should be given to attitude, gesture, and general manner in the pulpit, avoiding, says our author, "awkwardness, carelessness, haughtiness and harshness, formality, levity, monotony, and dullness;" and securing "ease, naturalness and refinement, self-possession and serenity of mind, gravity, affectionate anxiety for the welfare of men, and a deep, abiding, and powerful earnestness."

The sermon can never reach its full proportion of power and grace and unction without attention and successful application to these secondary and artistic features. The responsi-

bility is with the ministry. Success is not to be secured by a few juvenile efforts. Training is not to terminate with academic years. It is a life work. Culture must not only develop but regenerate nature. The study involves mind as well as imitation, and such practice as not only to secure the highest benefit of art, but to bury all semblance of art in the ease and grace of a second nature.

The intellectual part of a discourse, which we readily grant is the more important part, is twofold: it comprehends the quality of the materials of which it is composed, and also their order of arrangement, or the structure of the discourse. Good thoughts may exist under bad arrangement. It involves more cost and skill to build the house than to provide the materials. The arrangement of ideas in a sermon is called by the rhetoricians *disposition;* which in its larger sense applies to the order and proportion of the principal parts of the discourse, namely, introduction, argument, and conclusions, and in its restricted sense to the special order and divisions of the argument. Here, then, is a realm in which the mind of the preacher finds a most responsible activity. He is responsible for *what* he presents to the people, and for the *fittest method* in his power of presentation. Look, for instance, at *disposition* in its larger application, as just noticed. It is not our intention to discuss these points severally, but to take occasion to press them upon the attention of "whom it may concern," as being necessary to observe both for the effect of the sermon and the economy of time. It is now, for instance, our painful recollection that of all the sermons we have ever heard, from ministers of all denominations, by far the greater part have been constructed and delivered without a just observance of the true philosophy of disposition. Either the introduction, as to its length or matter, would trench upon the time or province of the argument, or perhaps, from its irrelevancy and impertinency, might better have been left out altogether; or the length and scope of the argument has left neither time nor material for the conclusion; or perhaps the conclusion was a random exhortation, a spiritless *résumé* of the argument, or a mere prolonging of words to avoid an abrupt closing. Inattention to the respective provinces of the several parts of a discourse never fails to occasion loss of time, irregularity of movement, disproportion

of parts, and a confusion and countermarching of the mind of the speaker, which must reproduce itself in that of the auditor, and impair if not defeat the practical effect of the sermon. The question of time is not to be overlooked. By the law of usage, which to the individual minister is as irrevocable and imperious as the law of gravitation, the maximum length of a sermon, in this age and country, is forty-five minutes, more commonly forty minutes. The arrangement of the sermon, therefore, must have respect to the relative claims of the different parts, as to time, so as to give the greatest effect to the discourse as a whole. If a wordy introduction is fatal to the effect of the argument, an exhaustive argument is no less so to the conclusion. "The design of an introduction is to prepare the mind of the hearer to understand and appreciate the subject of discourse. This necessity has its basis in our mental constitution."—P. 164. Its importance must be well considered beforehand, its character determined, and its brevity fixed by an impassable bound. The introduction is really no part of the discourse proper, any more than the portico is part of the house. In this respect it is simply negative. It removes an obscurity from the text, or a prejudice from the mind of the auditor, or prepares the way for the statement of the subject, and the sooner it is disposed of the better, always remembering that when used at all it should be with preparation and adroitly. In a sermon of forty-five minutes the introduction might be dispensed in three to five minutes, the argument limited to twenty-five minutes, leaving the remainder of time for the conclusion. We speak chiefly of topical discourses, or discourses propositionally discussed.

The argument of the sermon, being strictly an address to the understanding, should be simple, concise, and direct. The end aimed at in this part of the discourse is conviction. The first stronghold to be taken is the judgment and conscience. If the speaker succeeds here, planting himself inside the fortifications of the enemy, he turns his heavy guns against himself, and the conquest of the will becomes a hopeful enterprise. If he fails to carry the reason and conscience, the day is lost; he can proceed no further; exhortation or any suasive appeal is in vain. The argument should clearly comprehend the outline and "just circumference" of the subject, and unless the

special circumstances of the audience require a different method, the logical order, which is the order of the understanding or of the natural relation of ideas, is the best method of discussion. The difference between topical and textual discourses in this particular is not so great as has been often assumed by homiletical writers. In either case the speaker fixes in his mind the end proposed, a clear conception of which is the first step of preparation of a sermon of any kind, and then accepts the material thoughts of the subject, and their order of discussion, as the means for achieving this end. This alone gives unity to the plan, and entitles it to be called a sermon, as distinct from an expository or a miscellaneous lecture. The number of verses in a text is a matter of indifference, so that the scope and connection of the whole point clearly to one central idea, which was the object before the eye of the writer, and is now taken as the goal and end of the preacher. Every subject is best discussed by following the natural order of ideas. It then opens easily and without violence, like the riving of wood in the direction of the grain, or like the gentle unfolding of a bud, and the success of the speaker herein will depend on his powers of generalization and analysis. Nor can we renounce the time-honored and most philosophic custom of announcing the distinct heads of discourse. It aids the common mind in understanding, categorizing, retaining, and applying truth. If it be said that it enables the more sagacious to anticipate the speaker and thus lose interest in what he may afterward say, we reply, it can be so only where the preparations of the speaker fall below the general intelligence of the hearers.

But we have called attention to this subject chiefly to present the claims of that most neglected part of the sermon, the conclusion. Whether the particular mode of conclusion be by "inferences, recapitulation, appeal, or exhortation," it is in all cases supposed and designed to embody the practical force and uses of the subject. It is just at this part of the sermon that the preacher, having been successful in his argument, reaps the harvest of his labor. It is just here that, having by the argument broken the lines of the enemy, and silenced his heaviest batteries, and poised his wavering columns upon doubt and an "almost persuasion," he should vigorously push the advantage

to complete victory. In order to this there should be left time sufficient, a full repository of strength in the speaker, and an unflagged interest and patience in the hearers. Of all the methods of conclusion we confess to a strong preference for "inferences," and we could have wished our author had given this more prominence. It is true that this method "has a closer affinity with propositional discussion," and is not equally adapted to "explanatory and observational" sermons; but whenever it can be used, as in the majority of sermons it should be, it is one of the most pertinent, suggestive, and irresistible, though certainly the most difficult of all. "Whenever I hear a minister draw inferences from his sermon," said our old instructor, "I discover at once how much he knows of the doctrinal relations and practical worth of his subject, and what value he would have me put upon it." The inference has the advantage of reproducing the argument as to its moral effect, without the dullness of repetition, while it opens new views of the relations of truth which add confirmation to what has been already advanced. It is not possible to lay down a universal rule as to the time and order of making the application of truth. Generally the application of a sermon as a whole should be made at the end of a discourse, after the subject matter has been fully laid before the mind. But we fully agree with the author in saying that "there is oftentimes danger of failure in withholding the application of truth too long. Its edge may be blunted by suspense, and its glowing, burning power may cool off with delay. What is perhaps worse, if the application is habitually reserved for the conclusion, wary hearers, to whom severe truth is unacceptable, also form the habit of evading its power. It is the office of emotion as well as of judgment to induce decisions of the will, and as mental acts are closely related to each other, if not concurrent, the preacher must ever be on the alert for the golden moment of persuasion."—P. 189. It was herein that the power of our older Methodist preachers largely lay. When they had eliminated a truth clearly, and it had taken effect in the reason and conscience, they were instant in urging its practical application. The moment a breach was made in the wall, they were ready for the charge. A most admonitory illustration of this method is given in scripture, and nowhere more than in the most

argumentative and logical portions of them. Take, for instance, the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. The argument is close and logical, but constantly interrupted by digressions for the purpose of application and hortatory address. But though particular truths at opportune moments may require an instant application, yet the sermon as a whole should be generally though briefly reproduced in the conclusion, and its practical worth concentrated and urged with whatever skill and power and unction the preacher may possess.

We have taken the ground that, as a condition of the highest success of preaching—the realization of the original idea and intent of the commission—the sermon, as to its matter, structure, and delivery, must be more thoroughly studied, and practice must be brought under the more perfect discipline of science. The science of homiletics does not supply the power of the sermon. The machinery of the engine is quite distinct from the power that propels it, but the more perfect the machinery the more effectively and economically can the power be applied. The apostles were taught that they were to be "endued with power from on high" for their holy work only by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. All science and art and knowledge applicable to preaching, and sanctified to this work, serve no higher ends than as channels or means by which the Holy Spirit may reach and apply truth to the heart. But we have space to add only one other thought, and we add it as a *sine qua non* of the highest success of the pulpit; *preaching must be extempore.* The practice of reading sermons, or of reciting them *memoriter*, "word for word," is stifling the genius of the pulpit, and fettering the free movements of the mind at a moment when the highest advantages to oratory are to be derived from the occasion and the inspiration of the feelings. The practice is indisputably anti-apostolic, and the history of preaching from that day till now shows, that while the greatest masters in all ages, in the patristic, Catholic, and Protestant Churches, have given their voice for extempore preaching, the practice of reading, or of memoriter recitation, originated in a low type of piety or of culture, or of both, and has always brought pulpit eloquence to the level of mediocrity. Nature, history, the philosophy of eloquence, and the authority of scripture precedent are all against it. And what is gained

by it? "After three hundred years of discussion and experiment with reference to the advantages and disadvantages of reading, the best modern opinion is in favor of the primitive mode of extemporaneous address, rendered, however, as nearly perfect as possible by collateral and auxiliary writing."—P. 325. If, as M. Bautain says, "a man may certainly become a great orator by writing speeches and reciting them well, as Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon," we reply, it might be possible for a Bossuet and a Massillon to do it on set occasions, or "speeches," or in a given number of sermons, but the pulpit can never be circumscribed by this limit. M. Bautain himself, in his most admirable treatise on the "Art of Extempore Speaking," has opened up a better way, the highway of nature and all sound philosophy, to the highest success in oratory.

By extempore preaching we do not mean preaching without premeditation as to the matter and arrangement of thought. Extemporization extends to the words and style only. Between thought and style there is a natural relation. Thought, enlivened by feeling, will take on a form of words, according to an internal law of suggestion and fitness, more accurately, tersely, and effectively than by any labor of the reflective reason. Thought is but the inner soul of language, and language is but the organic outgrowth of thought. The best general regulating and generative principle of style, in a cultivated mind, is the conception of the speaker. Where an accurate and general knowledge of words has been already acquired, and a competency of knowledge of the subject attained, there a lively conception of the things to be said and an interpenetration of the soul with the moral worth and importance of the theme, will furnish to the disciplined mind the best and surest sources of appropriate style. What a man conceives thoroughly and feels vividly, he will express as accurately as it is possible with his knowledge of language. And it must be remembered that when the Spirit "teaches in that same hour what one ought to speak," it is not by teaching the meaning of words never before learned, but by helping the suggestive faculty, and bringing to remembrance words and images already stored in the understanding. If a subject has been intellectually elaborated, arranged, and impressed upon the mind—impressed in the determined order of discussion and delivery—and this

plan written out, to be used if need be as a prompter to the memory, words will flow with ease and fitness, and with a power proportioned to the force with which the subject impresses the mind of the speaker.

On a subject upon which volumes have been written we can do no justice in the compass of a few sentences; but we take the occasion to lift the voice of warning against the habit of reading sermons, unhappily increasing in many parts in the Methodist pulpit; increasing, too, at a time when the best and wisest men of other Churches are striving after more of the freedom of extemporaneous address. Our author has done an excellent service to the Church in candidly discussing this subject, and showing the preponderant weight of opinion and philosophy where it belongs on the side of extemporaneous speaking. Dr. Spring, in his "Power of the Pulpit," quotes high authority both from Andover and Princeton, showing that preaching has declined in power during the present century. If we were to venture a suggestion as to the cause, we would say there has been too much reliance upon the manuscript and not enough upon the inspiration of the subject; and also that sermons have too much emanated from the college stand-point, and not enough from the inner life of the preacher, and the yearning love of souls. We claim for the pulpit all the knowledge which is legitimate for the purposes of interpretation of Scripture, the illustration, defense, and enforcement of theological truth, and all that discipline and culture needed for the agreeableness and practical efficiency of the delivery of that truth, with all the freedom which the nature of the case requires, the authority of Scripture sanctions, and the Holy Ghost inspires.

Art. VII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The Essays and Reviews—Synodical Condemnation—The Powers of Convocation.—A novel and very important step in the case of the Essays and Reviews was taken by the Convocation of Canterbury, in the session which commenced on the 21st of June. As we have carefully traced the history of this important case in the previous numbers of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, our readers may remember that soon after the first excitement produced by the publication of the Essays and Reviews, the Lower House of Convocation prayed the House of Bishops that

action should be taken in condemnation of the book. The subject was, however, postponed, on the ground that the question would come before a legal tribunal of which some of the bishops were members. The judicial committee of Council having given judgment, the subject was renewed at the ensuing session, and a committee of the Upper House was appointed to examine the book. That committee gave in its report on June 21, specifying several errors of doctrine in each of the Essays, and ending with a formal condemnation of the book. The adoption of the report was moved by the Bishop of Oxford, and opposed by the Bishop of London, mainly on the ground that it was undesirable to revive interest in a book that had well nigh passed into oblivion. The report was, however, adopted, and a formal condemnation passed, only two of the bishops, those of London and Lincoln, dissenting. The Archbishop of Canterbury very emphatically expressed his concurrence in this course, stating his belief that if they did not adopt it they would be betraying that trust which their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ had committed to them. He decided that that moderate condemnation should be the act of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. The censure was conveyed in the following terms:

That this Synod, having appointed committees of the Upper and the Lower House to examine and report upon the volume entitled "Essays and Reviews," and the said committees having severally reported thereon, thus hereby synodically condemn the said volume as containing teachings contrary to the doctrine received by the United Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

This resolution was then sent down to the Lower House, where, after long and animated debate, in which the "synodical" condemnation of the book was especially opposed by Dr. Stanley, it was concurred in by a majority of 39 to 19.

The statesmen of England regard it as doubtful whether the bishops have, according to the law of England, the right to condemn a book. An important and interesting discussion took place on this subject in the House of Lords on the 15th of July. Lord Houghton (better known by his former name as Monckton Milnes) asked the Lord Chancellor what notice the government intended to take of the judgment recently pronounced by Convocation upon the Essays and Reviews. Lord Houghton reviewed the history of Convocation from the time of Queen Mary, when it condemned the Book of Common Prayer, down to the controversy over Bishop Hoadley's sermons, which caused the suspension of the functions of Convocation for more than a century, and he inquired of the Lord Chancellor whether the recent proceedings of Convocation were legal. The reply of the Lord Chancellor is to the highest degree insulting, not only for Convocation, but for the Church of which the Convocations of Canterbury and York are the highest ecclesiastical boards. To the functions of Convocation he referred in these contemptuous remarks:

There are three modes of dealing with Convocation when it is permitted to come into action and transact real business. The first is, while they are harmlessly busy, to take no notice of their proceedings; the second is, when they seem likely to get into mischief, to prorogue and put an end to their proceedings; the third, when they have done something clearly beyond their powers, is to bring them before a court of justice and punish them.

In his opinion Convocation would transcend their power if they should attempt to pass any sentence, any ordinance, or any constitution without the previous license or authority of the crown, as, according to the laws of England, "the crown is the fountain of all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical and spiritual, as well as temporal." The consequences of a transgression of this law would be very severe for the bishops, a year's deprivation of their benefices. In view of these grave consequences, he, the Lord Chancellor, had shrunk from taking the first step of asking counsel in the matter. Moreover, the thing called a synodical judgment was simply "a series of well lubricated terms, a sentence so oily and saponaceous that no one would grasp it—like an eel, it slipped through the fingers." It was "simply nothing." He warned the bishops to be in future careful not to trespass upon the prerogatives of the crown, and if Convocation should venture to take any such step, to leave the meeting. The replies of the bishops to this insulting speech were very feeble, none of them

standing manfully up for the right of the Church to decide on heretical doctrines.

THE CASE OF BISHOP COLENSO—CHARGE OF THE METROPOLITAN BISHOP OF CAPETOWN—THE SENTENCE OF DEPOSITION—THE COLENSO CASE BEFORE THE PRIVY COUNCIL.—In the colonies, some of the bishops are taking a bolder stand for the assertion of the rights of the Church against the State. This is, in particular, the case with the Bishop of Capetown, who is the Metropolitan of the Province of South Africa, to which the See of Natal belongs. The bishop has published the Charge which he, as Metropolitan, delivered in the Cathedral of Natal on the deposition of Bishop Colenso. This is a document of considerable importance, as it gives us the views of one of the metropolitans of the colonial churches on the powers claimed for this office. The bishop says that at a meeting of English and of Colonial bishops, which was convoked by the late Archbishop of Canterbury in 1853, it was resolved that metropolitans should be at once appointed over the Churches of Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa, (Australia and the East Indies being already under metropolitans,) and the concurrence and joint action of the Crown in the appointment of metropolitans was sought and obtained. The Crown gave what force of law it was in its power to do to the decision of the Church, and proclaimed by letters patent the see of Capetown to be the metropolitan see of the province of South Africa, and the bishops of Grahamstown and Natal (the other sees were not then founded) to be under the jurisdiction of the same. Each of the eight South African bishops that have been appointed since the province was formed, solemnly swore at his consecration before God that he would render canonical obedience to the Bishop of Capetown as metropolitan. He, the Bishop of Capetown, was received by the Church of South Africa as metropolitan, and exercised that office for nine years. His jurisdiction was recognized by all, until recently Colenso denied it and protested against it, although he (Colenso) received his jurisdiction as bishop from the same source from which the Bishop of Capetown received his jurisdiction as metropolitan. The bishop then proceeds to review the relation of civil courts to the tribunal of religious bodies at great length, contending that he has assumed no greater power than would be conceded to a Roman Catholic bishop or Wesleyan superintendent. He denies that Colenso has a right to appeal from his decision to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, because this is a court of appeal only for the establishment, and purely because it is an establishment, with its whole status defined by statute law, and the non-established Churches of the colonies have absolutely no concern with it. He admits that Colenso may appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench, but not against the sentence of the metropolitan, but against any person who may withhold funds from him to which he may think himself entitled. The bishop concludes by declaring the diocese of Natal a widowed diocese. He states that until the consecration of another bishop he has appointed the Dean of Natal Vicar-General of the diocese. Subsequently to the delivery of the charge of the metropolitan, the Dean of Natal, the Archdeacon, the parochial clergy, and the church-wardens of the diocese, signed a declaration, by which they pledged themselves not to recognize Colenso any longer as their bishop.

The formal decree of deposition of Bishop Colenso was read after the Nicene Creed, on Sunday, the 25th of April, in the cathedrals of Capetown and Grahamstown, and on subsequent Sundays in the various churches of Natal, as well as in the chief church of each of the other dioceses included in the province. Opposition to the promulgation of the sentence was only manifested at D'Urban, the chief seaport town of Natal, where a protest was signed by twenty-seven persons, and transmitted by the church-wardens to the metropolitan.

On May 31st Bishop Colenso was served in England, where he was still staying, by Messrs. Brooks & Dubois, proctors for the Metropolitan Bishop of Capetown, with a copy of the decree of deposition. As this document is of considerable importance for the history of the Colenso case, we give it entire. It is as follows:

Whereas, in and by the sentence pronounced by us, on the 16th December, 1863, against the Bishop of Natal, we did adjudge to suspend the operation of the said sentence until the 16th April, 1865, for the purpose of affording the said Bishop of Natal an opportunity of retracting and recalling the extracts therein mentioned and referred to; and *whereas*, the

said sentence so delivered by us on the said 16th December, 1863, was personally served on the said Bishop of Natal, at No. 23 Sussex Place, Kensington, in the County of Middlesex, on the 26th January, 1864, as appears from the affidavit of service thereof, duly filed of record; and *whereas*, it has been proved to our satisfaction that the Bishop of Natal did not, on or before the 4th day of March last past, file of record with Douglas Dubois, of No. 7 Godliman-street, Doctors' Commons, London, proctor, solicitor, and notary public, our commissary in England, a full, unconditional, and absolute retraction, in writing, of the extracts so mentioned and referred to in the said sentence; nor did, on or before the 16th day of April instant, file with the registrar of this diocese, at his office in Capetown, such full, unconditional, and absolute retraction and recall of the said extracts; and *whereas*, the said sentence has now, in terms of the provisions thereof, and by reason of the premises, become of full force and effect;

Now, therefore, we do hereby adjudge and decree the sentence so pronounced on the said 16th of December, 1863, to be of full force, virtue, and effect from and after this date; and we do, accordingly, decree and sentence the said Bishop of Natal to be deposed from the said office as such bishop, and prohibited from the exercise of any divine office within any part of the metropolitical province of Capetown.

(Signed) R. Capetown, [L.S.]

Bishop Colenso had already, before being served with a copy of this decree, issued a letter to his diocese, in which he disputes the power claimed by the Bishop of Capetown and the other bishops of South Africa to depose him from office. He maintains that of the nine charges brought against him, four have already been disposed of by the late judgment of the Privy Council on the case of the "Essays and Reviews." His friends in England, in the meanwhile, collected a fund to enable him to plead his cause before the English Courts. This fund amounted at the beginning of May to over £2,000.

The first proceeding in England, connected with the deposition of Colenso, was commenced before the judicial committee of the Privy Council on June 23d. The petition of the Bishop of Natal prayed that her Majesty would be pleased to declare the petitioner to be entitled to hold his see until the letters patent granted to him should be canceled by due process of law, for some sufficient cause of forfeiture, and to declare that the letters patent granted to the Bishop of Capetown, in so far as they purported to create a court of criminal justice within the colony, and to give to the Archbishop of Canterbury an appellate jurisdiction, had been unduly obtained from her Majesty, and did not affect the petitioner's right. The petitioner also prayed that the pretended trial and sentence should be declared void and of no effect, and that an inhibition, as was usual in ecclesiastical cases, should issue against the proceedings under the sentence pending the appeal. The petition was ordered to stand over.

The Colonial Bishoprics Council, in the meanwhile, decided to carry the amount hitherto paid as a stipend to Dr. Colenso as Bishop of Natal to a separate reserved account, pending a final and authoritative decision of the legality of the Bishop of Capetown's judgment.

The interest of the Christian Churches generally, and especially the Anglican Churches, in the progress of the two great English controversies—the "Essays and Reviews" and Colenso—continues unabated. As soon as the Oxford Declaration (see Meth. Quar. Rev., July, 1864) was made known in Canada, the Bishop of Montreal proposed to the bishops of the provinces to circulate the same for signature in their respective dioceses, in order that they might show their full agreement on these great points of their belief with their brethren in England. This proposition was generally responded to; for from the pamphlet containing the "Canada Declaration," with the signatures, it appears that out of the whole province of Canada there are not forty clergymen who have failed to record their names.

In the United States, twenty-two bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church issued in the papers of the denomination the following declaration, which the clergy were invited to sign:

We, the undersigned, bishops and clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, hold it to be our bounden duty to the Church of England and Ireland, and to the souls of men, to declare our firm belief that the said Church, in common with our own and the whole Catholic Church, maintains, without reserve or qualification, the inspiration and divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing but being the word of God; and further teaches, in the words of our blessed Lord, that the "punish-

ment" of the "cursed," equally with the "life" of the "righteous," is everlasting.

The school which sympathizes with the "Essays and Reviews" has not a single organ in the United States, and may therefore be supposed to have very few, if any, adherents. An objection was nevertheless raised as to the expediency of issuing such a declaration by the Bishop of Maryland, who, from a High-Church point of view, declared that although he fully sympathized with the spirit of the address, he could not sign it, because he thought it the function of the General Synod of the Church alone to pronounce on doctrines of the Church.

Art. VIII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

The Theological Cyclopedia of Dr. Herzog, (*Real Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche,*) which was commenced in the year 1854, has just been concluded by the appearance of the eighteenth volume. This cyclopedia far exceeds, in point of scholarship and completeness, anything that has ever been published before, and it may be truly called, in some respects, the ablest work of Protestant theology. It counts among its contributors nearly every prominent German theologian. It is in itself a complete theological library, and no theologian who wishes to inform himself of what has been done in any department of theology can do so without examining it. Of course, a work of this extent may be expected to have some gaps and deficiencies, and an appendix is therefore at once to be published, which will contain some important additions, besides an index. Though abounding in valuable information for Protestant scholars of every country, the work is chiefly intended and adapted for the German market, and it therefore is of course incomplete in point of American, English, and in general non-German, Christian biography. Translations of this work, therefore, would never supersede the want of similar original works in every great Protestant country.

One of the most interesting and learned contributions to the recent theological literature of Germany is a monograph, by Dr. Gustav Oppert, on the legend of Prester John. (*Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage und in Geschichte.*) In the middle ages, all Europe believed in Prester John; and Pope Alexander III. even compromised his pretensions to infallibility by dispatching an embassador and an epistle to a potentate who was nothing but a myth. The legend derived additional countenance from vague reports respecting the actual Syrian Church in Malabar, and from a fictitious letter said to have been written by Prester John to the Emperor of Constantinople and to contain a circumstantial account of his kingdom. When, at a later period, the existence of a Christian kingdom in Abyssinia became known to Marco Polo, he had no remorse in classing "Habescia" as a second division of India, thus supplying a link of identification with Prester John. At last, the researches of the Catholic missionaries made it clear that no Christian empire existed in Asia, when, by common consent, the locality of Prester John was transferred to Africa. Dr. Oppert, who is one of the most learned Orientalists now living, identifies the original Prester John with Korkhan, the Tartar sovereign of Cashgar about the beginning of the twelfth century, whose empire, like those of many Asiatic sovereigns, rose suddenly to great power, and disappeared without leaving a trace. It seems uncertain whether he was really a Christian or not, though the very uncertainty attaching to so remarkable a fact is an argument against it. He may easily have been represented as such by the Nestorians, who were grateful for any patronage, and whose toleration went very far. Hope and imagination did the rest. The singular ascription of a priestly character to a secular prince probably arose from vague accounts of the politico-spiritual administration of Thibet.

Among the numerous works on the Life of Jesus which now appear, the posthumous lectures of Schleiermacher

on the subject, which were delivered in Berlin in 1834, and are now published by K. A. Rütenik, will attract attention, (*Das Leben Jesu.*) Occupying an intermediate position between the rationalists and the strictly orthodox, it was Schliermacher's aim to reconcile the two parties.

FRANCE.

Of all the numerous works by which Protestant and Roman Catholic writers have combated the influence of the work of Rénan, none has produced a more profound sensation than M. Guizot's Meditations, (*Meditations sur la Religion Chretienne.*) M. Guizot explains in his preface the matter and plan of his book, an extract from which will give an idea of the ends he has in view.

The "Meditations" are divided into four series. In the first, I expose and establish what is, in my view, the essence of the Christian religion, that is to say, the natural problems to which it responds, the fundamental dogmas by which it resolves these problems, and the supernatural facts upon which these dogmas repose: the creation, the revelation, the inspiration of the holy books, God as he is in the Bible, Jesus Christ as shown us by the evangelists.

After the essence of the Christian religion comes its history. This will be the subject of a second series of "Meditations," in which I shall examine the holy books.

The third series of these "Meditations" will be consecrated to the study of the actual state of the Christian religion, of its internal and external conditions.

Finally, in the fourth series of the "Meditations" I will attempt to prefigure the future of the Christian religion, and to indicate by what paths it is called to conquer completely and to govern morally this little corner of the universe which we call our earth, and in which are shown forth the designs and the power of God, in the same way that they are, doubtless, shown forth in an infinity of worlds unknown to us.

I have passed thirty years of my life in wrestling in a noisy arena for the establishment of political liberty and the maintenance of order according to the law. I have learned in the labors and trials of this struggle what Christian faith and liberty are worth. God grant that in the repose of my retreat I may be able to consecrate to their cause the remainder of my days and of my strength. It is the highest favor and the greatest honor which he, in his goodness, can grant men.

This work of Guizot's is one of the ablest apologetic works on the truth of Christianity which have ever been written. It scrupulously confines itself to a defense of those Christian doctrines which are common to all Christians — Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Eastern — who believe in the inspiration of the Bible; and the work is, therefore, welcomed no less by the Roman Catholic than the Protestant press.

Besides the work of Guizot, numerous other works have appeared during the past few months on the Life of Jesus. We mention among them the works of Louis Veuillot, the well-known ultramontane writer, *La Vie de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ;* Abbé Daras, *Histoire de Notre Seigneur Jesus Christ;* Salvador, a Jewish writer of distinction, *Jesus Christ et Sa Doctrine;* and Colani, one of the leaders of the Rationalistic party in the Reformed Church, *Examen de la Vie de Jesus de M. Rénan.*

While most of the Rationalists of Europe claim the right to retain their membership in the old Protestant Churches, and even desire to live there side by side with the Evangelical party, M. Pécaut demands, on the part of a consistent Rationalism, a complete separation. (*De l'Avenir du Theism Chretien.*) He admits that the orthodox, even of the most moderate school, and those who recognize in Jesus only a man, can no longer worship together. He consistently demands a new Church of pure Deism, (or Theism,) with pastors, catechists, and missionaries. The New Church is not to break altogether with the past; it will derive its inspirations from the religious men of all times, from Moses, David, Isaiah, Sakya Muni (Buddha), Mohammed, and especially Jesus, the foremost among them, and our greatest teacher. But the old Bible must be set aside, as mostly false, obsolete, legendary; and a new Bible must be composed of those passages which agree with the views of the theists. The only doctrines which M. Pécaut wishes to be preached to our age are those of God the father of men, of the brotherhood of all men, and of the high mission of mankind; of Jesus the greatest of all mortals; and of sincere repentance as sufficient for obtaining for sinners forgiveness from a merciful God.

Alexandre Weill, a Jewish writer and a representative of the radical wing among the Jewish rationalists, has published a work on Moses and the Talmud, (*Moïse et la Talmud.*) The work is not strictly scientific, but it is an application of the opinions of the author to the Old Testament. According to M. Weill, man can figure God to himself only in two different manners: either God is immutable, absolute, and the only expression of him is the physical or moral law; or God is an arbitrary being. M. Weill declares himself for the former of these views; and according to him, Moses was the apostle of this idea. Moses, according to M. Weill, was a philosophical legislator, who knew God to be *The Law*, the inflexible Law, which admits of no miracle in the order of nature and of no forgiveness in the moral order of things. All the passages of the Old Testament which suppose in God a will, or human affections, are additions made by the rabbinical school which produced the Talmud. M. Weill claims to be able to separate what belongs in the Old Testament to Moses and what to the scribes. He explains the use of the two names of God in the Old Testament in the same way. "Elohim" he maintains to be the strong, powerful God, that is to say, the arbitrary God of the priests. "Jehovah," on the contrary, is the very essence of things; their law. While Elohim works miracles, Jehovah, the God of Moses, does not: he reveals himself directly to the heart and to reason. M. Weill has a profound knowledge of the rabbinical writings, but seems to be possessed of very little common sense.

M. Poujoulat, the author of a Life of St. Augustine and numerous other works, has commenced, in connection with Abbé Raulx, a translation of the complete works of St. Augustine. The translators claim that this is the first complete French translation of the great Church Father. The work will be completed in twelve volumes. (*Saint Augustin: Œuvres Completes.*)

Art. IX.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

American Quarterly Church Review, July, 1864. (New York.)—1. New York City a Field for Church Work. 2. On the Proper Location of a First Meridian and System of Astronomical Observatories. 3. William Hickling Prescott. 4. Uses and Abuses of Fiction. 5. Marshall on Papal and Protestant Missions. 6. Canon Wordsworth and Anglo-Italian Catholicity. 7. Syllabus of Christian Doctrine.

Freewill Baptist Quarterly, July, 1864. (Dover, N. H.)—1. The Sufferings of Christ the Lord. 2. Woman's Privilege in Worship. 3. Theory of the Formation of the Solar System. 4. Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought. 5. Recognition in Heaven. 6. Life and Times of Paul. 7. The Gospel the Theme of the Ministry. 8. Moral Monuments of Real Worth. 9. Review of the Argument for Pedobaptism, Founded on the Identity of the Jewish and Christian Churches.

Danville Review, June, 1864, (Danville, Ky.)—1. The Bible not a Text Book on Natural Science. 2. The Bible considered as Cause to an Effect, or as Means to an End. 3. The Meaning and Use of סלה, Selah. 4. Perjury Exemplified in Secession. 5. The Men of Danville, No. II. 6. Experiment in Translation of the Talmud—Valuable Things in the Talmud. 7. The Divine Origin and Supremacy of Civil Government.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, July, 1864. (Boston, Mass.)—1. When are the Dead raised? 2. The Contraband. 3. Faith and Works. 4. Charles the Bold. 5. In Memoriam: A Tribute to T. Starr King.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1864. (Andover, Mass.)—1. Free Communion. 2. Authorship of the Pentateuch. 3. The Author of the Apocalypse. 4. The Doctrine of God's Providence, in itself, and in its Relations and Uses. 5. Whedon on the Will. 6. Egyptology, Oriental Travel and Discovery.

We trust that the series of articles on the authorship of the Pentateuch, by Professor Bartlett of the Chicago Theological Seminary, now in course of publication in the Bibliotheca Sacra, will speedily be given to the public in book form. We know nothing on the subject which would be so timely and effective as these able and eloquent productions.

Professor Newhall's article contains a very excellent analysis and summary of the book it reviews. To those who feel that the work itself is too severe a study for their prosecution, this article may be recommended as the best existing substitute.

THE AMERICAN AND PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, July, 1864. (New York.) 1. The Relations of the Pulpit to the State. 2. The Taborites and the Germ of the Moravian Church. 3. The Messiah's Second Advent. 4. The Epistle of Barnabas. 5. Theories of Currency. 6. The General Assembly. 7. The Logos in John and Philo.

Dr. Smith has a book notice of Whedon on the Will, not remarkable for its magnanimity on any point, but remarkable for its *μικροψυχία* on one point, namely, our use of a number of new terms:

> His style is often clear and concise, but it is occasionally marred by novel and harsh words and constructions, as "freedomists," "equilibrial will," "automatically resultant from inalternative particular causations," "volitionary faculty," "volitional volition," "predicable of the corporiety," "unipotent and alternative causation," and the like. He defines will as "the power of the soul by which it is the conscious author of an intelligent act," and as having essentially "an alternative power."

This is an unfortunate selection of the objectionable terms and phrases in the work. The phrase "equilibrial will" does not occur. "Volitionary faculty" is quoted, with the proper marks of quotation, from Dr. Shedd, being that gentleman's own invention. "Volitional volition," together with "material matter" and "zero volition," are professedly absurd phrases, purposely used to exemplify a necessitarian absurdity. "Predicable of the corporeity," with the exception of the orthographical error in the last word, is a perfectly correct phrase. As to the propriety of using new words to meet the demands of modern thought, we will quote a precedent or two.

Near the entire nomenclature of Dr. Smith's translated History of Doctrines is unknown to our Webster's old quarto, including such

specimens as soteriological, apologetics, apologetico-dogmatic, Christological, angelology, etc. To these might be added such novelties as solidarity, determinism, world-organism, separatism, particularistic, atomistic, jural, hereditariness, nihilianism, emphasized, macrocosmic, adoptionism, pietistic, and many others equally unknown to our Webster. We think a magnanimous criticism would scorn to carp at this terminology, as no criticism that we have seen ever has. And yet we see not why freedomism, freedomist, and freedomistic, (in place of the prolix and unmanageable old *libertarian*,) are not quite as good and quite as necessary as *nihilianism*, *atomistic*, or *particularistic*. We think *equilibrial* is far better than *jural*, and *inalternative* as good as *hereditariness*.

In a single article of the North American Review of fifty-two pages we note the following words not found in our Webster: protension, extendedness, negativity, actualized, tridimensional, elaborative, regulative, subjectivity, objectivity, irreducibility, untenability, algorithmy, phoronomy, qualifiedly, Spinozistic, empiricistic, illimitation, originator, relativity, pseudo-reality, and several other novel compounds.

In the course of a few hours' reading we have found in Herbert Spencer, an author commended by the New Englander for "purity" of language, the following words, which we fail to find in Webster's old quarto, namely, seriality, hemispherical, specialization, demarcate, localization, celt-makers, unanalytical, axial, epicyclical, pseudidea, equilateralness, irretractile, connature, ratio-ing, thousand-tongued, inflexional, differently-placed, time-relations, indistinguishableness, irresilient, statico-dynamical, irrecompressible, infissile, irretractile.

In opening Herbert Spencer's Psychology our eye lights first upon the following paragraphs, exhibiting "an amazing fecundity of huge and unusual words:"

Defined in its totality then, the perception of body as presenting statico-dynamical and statical attributes is a composite state of consciousness, having for its primary elements the impressions of resistance and extension *unconditionally* united with each other and the subject in relations of coincidence in time and adjacency in space; having for its secondary elements the impressions of touch, pressure, tension, and motion, variously united with each other in relations of simultaneity and sequence that are severally *conditional* on the nature of the object and the acts of the subject, and all of them *conditionally* united with the primary elements by relations of sequence; and having for its further secondary elements certain yet undefined relations, (constituting the cognitions of size and form, hereafter to be analyzed,) which are also *conditionally* united alike with the primary elements and the other secondary elements.—P. 216.

§ 116. Out of the primordial irritability, which (excluding the indeterminate types of life that underlie both divisions of the organic world) characterizes animal organisms in general, and in virtue of which arises the response produced by the contact of solid bodies, as distinguished from the fluid medium, are gradually evolved those various modified kinds of irritability answering to the various attri-

butes of matter. The fundamental attribute of matter is resistance. The fundamental sense shows itself as a faculty of responding to resistance.—P. 245.

We quote not these passages to depreciate Mr. Spencer's style, believing it, as we do, to be about the best possible expression of his thought; but to expose the odd caprice which selects a particular book as the object of an *ad captandum* style of criticism. Upon this subject of new terms Professor Mansel well says:

> For the phraseology which I have occasionally been compelled to employ in the course of the following remarks, no apology will be required by those acquainted with the history of mental science. In no branch of study is it so necessary to observe the Aristotelian precept, ὀνοματοποιεῖν σαφηνείας ἕνεκεν, to manufacture words for the sake of clearness. Nine tenths of the confusion and controversy that have existed in this department are owing to that unwillingness to innovate in matters of language, which leads to the employment of the same term in various shades of meaning, and with reference to various phenomena of consciousness. In this respect philosophy is under deep obligations to the purism of German writers, which has enabled subsequent thinkers to examine the most important problems of psychology apart from the old associations of language. A new phraseology may occasion some little difficulty at the outset of a work; but to adhere to an inadequate vocabulary merely because its expressions are established, is to involve the whole of the subject in hopeless confusion and obscurity.

THE BOSTON REVIEW, July, 1864. (Boston.) 1. The Relations of Sin and Atonement to Infant Salvation. 2. The Publication of Free Descriptions of Vice. 3. The Rabbies, the Mischna, and the Talmuds, and their Aid in New Testament Studies. 4. Huxley on Man's Place in Nature. 5. Teachings of the Rebellion. 6. Pascal. 7. Short Sermons.

The most candid and manly notice, on the whole, of Whedon on the Will is furnished by this able organ of Old School Calvinism in New England. We note a few of its points.

The reviewer holds that our concession to Edwards of an unsurpassed "acuteness of intellect," not as an *umpire* but as an "*advocate*," and as being "about the acutest '*advocate*' that ever formed a special plea," to be a "belittling" of and "a fling at an opponent." We regret to be so interpreted. So far from intending a "belittling" of an opponent, our purpose was, while exercising our right to deal with the fallacies of Edwards just as we would with the fallacies of anybody else, to secure the retention of the profoundest yet most consistent respect for his unsurpassed acuteness of intellect.

Again, the reviewer remarks that "to have shown some difficulties in the Edwardian doctrine is not to have demonstrated its falseness. To find or drill cracks in a wall is not to build a stronger one." That is a just remark. But have we merely found cracks in the wall? Notwithstanding the subdued language of our preface, is not our work thoroughly (we do not now say *validly*) both destructive and constructive? Do we not, in our Part First, state our system as at issue with the opposite; in our Second, prosecute an exhaustive refutation

of the entirety of the opposing argument; and in our Third, establish our affirmative argument? If our argument be valid (which is not now the question) it sweeps cleanly the entire ground, in order to occupy it with a positive structure.

Again, the reviewer objects to our coupling Edwards with Hobbes. Did he ever see any injustice in such classifications by Edwards as "Arminian, Pelagian, or Epicurean," and "Pelagians, semi-Pelagians, Jesuits, Socinians, Arminians, and others"? Did he see anything uncandid in Dr. Pond's classification of "Arminians, Pelagians, and infidels?" That we coupled the names of Hobbes and Edwards with no ungenerous animus, is clear from the fact that while we discuss Hobbes extensively, and see no difference in his doctrine of necessity *in itself* and that of Edwards, we do in no case in our work use a single expression reflecting odium from Hobbes upon Edwards. The only apparent exception to this is where, in self-defense against Edwards's including freedomism with atheism, we show that *the freedomist and the atheist is never the same man*, but that the atheist is always a necessitarian. And this we did, not by way of retort, nor without disclaiming all invidious classification of infidels with our Calvinistic friends, but to illustrate to the latter, by a reciprocal dealing, how wise it is to disuse such classifications.

Again, the reviewer, *perhaps* with no purpose of "a fling at an opponent," or "effort at belittling," is pleased to say that there is "nothing particularly new" in the work. And as the author had said in his preface that he "would not offer this treatise to the public did not he believe he had furnished some new thoughts," did we concede the reviewer's denial of "anything new," we should pronounce our book undeserving publication. Our reply is this. In our earlier days, when once charged with plagiary in a certain production, we offered our accuser fifty dollars to produce the original, and so at once vindicated our character and saved our money. To this critic we might with equal safety, doubling the sum for every passage, take up some hundreds of pages of the work and say, "please produce the originals." We omit all reference to a multiplicity of minute yet important points in the work, such as special definitions, which often form the key to entire arguments, and little points of explanation that elucidate whole areas. We might offer him a tempting premium to furnish any such analysis of freedom as is found in Chapter II, Part First; or (with exceptions stated in the book) any such treatment of Particular Volition as is furnished in pages 88–104; or any such refutation of Edwards's Infinite Series as in pages 121–128; or any such definition of Motive Force with such application of the definition as rives through the very heart of Edwards's book, as are furnished in

pages 128–163; or any such riddling of the entire theory of Moral Inability as in pages 239–266; or any such demolition of Edwards's maxim of Responsibility as in pages 396–407; or any such exposure of Edwards's appalling theory of the divine Authorship of Sin as in pages 427–436. Neither the positions taken, nor the substance or the shaping of the argument, can be fairly produced in any previous work. There is indeed a sense in which it might be said that neither this work nor Edwards's furnished "anything new." Hobbes and Collins taught the same necessitarianism as Edwards, with the same general arguments. Dugald Stewart remarks: "It is remarkable how completely Collins has anticipated Dr. Jonathan Edwards."—*Appendix to Moral Powers, Sec. V.* Edwards did not create a new necessitarianism, as we have not created a new freedomism. And yet that Edwards's work was "particularly new" who doubts? And if the reviewer can see nothing similarly new in the present volume, we promptly tell him he needs an undistorted pair of spectacles.

Finally, the reviewer doubts "if it carries much conviction to any who are not already persuaded of its correctness." We entertain a similar doubt. Books and arguments do not convince self-committed opponents, though they shape the minds of inquiring multitudes. If the reviewer will note the concluding paragraph of our preface he will find several classes specified, for whom the work can scarcely be considered as written. We believe that the exclusion of necessitarianism and predestination from the circle of Christian theology (as was the case in the primitive Church) would be a great advance in Christian truth and holiness. Yet we cannot affirm a belief that any argument can remove them from the minds of the Boston reviewers or of their class, or that its removal would make *them* holier men or more efficient workmen in the cause of Christ. Yet when these learned and able Christian brethren on the opposite side concede the work to be "a very able defense of the metaphysical ground of the Arminian theology," they pronounce it a complete success. It will convert no immediate opponent. It will *form* and modify the views of countless thousands. It will be a contribution to the basis of the theology of the evangelical Church of the future; a basis, that is, for the restoration of the Church to the best theology of the primitive ages.

English Reviews.

British and Foreign Evangelical Review, July, 1864. (London.)—1. Historical Sketch of the Later German Philosophy. 2. Inspiration. 3. The Church under the Christian Emperors. 4. The Imprecatory Psalms. 5. Mediatorial Sovereignty. 6. The Danish Hymnology. 7. Lyman Beecher, D.D. 8. The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel.

9. Froude's History of England. 10. Egyptology, Oriental Travel and Discovery. 11. Biblical and Miscellaneous Intelligence. 12. German Theological Literature.

British Quarterly Review, July, 1864. (London.)—1. The Pentateuch and the "Higher Criticism." 2. Alpine Experiences. 3. Lewes on Aristotle's Scientific Writings. 4. The English Post-Office. 5. Kingsley and Newman—Romanism in England. 6. The British Navy, Past and Present. 7. Laurence Sterne. 8. Frescoes of the Houses of Parliament. 9. The English Writers before Chaucer. 10. The Life of Christ—Ebrard and Lange.

Christian Remembrancer, July, 1864. (London.)—1. The Church of St. Patrick. 2. Textual Criticism of the New Testament. 3. The Burial Service. 4. Cornewall Lewis on the Administrations of Great Britain, 1783–1830. 5. Tacitus and his Translators. 6. Dr. Newman's Apology. 7. Marsh on the Origin and History of the English Language. 8. Finlay's Greek Revolution.

London Quarterly Review, (Wesleyan,) July, 1864. (London.)—1. Forsyth's Life of Cicero. 2. Gibraltar. 3. Thackeray and Modern Fiction. 4. Hannah's Bampton Lecture. 5. Our Mother Tongue. 6. The Picture of the Present Year. 7. Recent Theological Translations.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, July, 1864. (London.)—1. Eccentricities of Hymnology: Early Moravian Hymn Books. 2. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. 3. Standard Edition of the English New Testament of the Genevan Version. 4. The Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. 5. Contributions to Modern Ecclesiastical History, No. IV; Chronicles of the Congregation of Lysa. 6. Thoughts on Genesis ix, 6, in Relation to Capital Punishment. 7. The Jews and the Talmud after the Time of Christ. 8. The Vocation of the Preacher. 9. Æthiopic Prayers, etc. 10. The Eucharist: Greek, Latin, and Anglican. 11. An Old Account of the Strauss Controversy. 12. The Encomium of the Martyrs. An Inedited Oration of Eusebius of Cesarea.

North British Review, May, 1864. (New York, reprint.)—1. Lord Elgin.—In Memoriam. 2. A Fortnight in Faroe. 3. Energy. 4. Mr. Trollope's Novels. 5. Day-Dreams of a Schoolmaster. 6. Christian Missions. 7. The Old Anglo-Scottish Dialects. 8. Rambles in the Deserts of Syria. 9. Sporting Books. 10. Our Foreign Policy.

Westminster Review, July, 1864. (New York: reprint.)—1. Public Schools in England. 2. Novels with a Purpose. 3. Liberal French Protestantism. 4. Mr. Lewes's Aristotle. 5. The Tenure of Land. 6. Dr. Newman and Mr. Kingsley. 7. Edmond About on Progress. 8. Thackeray.

German Reviews.

Dorpater Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche. (Dorpat Journal of Theology. Second Number.) 1. Luthard, Contributions to Dogmatics. 2. Eberhard, What teaches Holy Writ on the Condition of the Soul between Death and Resurrection. 3. Eichhorn, The Struggle for the Re-establishment of Lutheranism in Baden. 4. Gruner, A View in the Eastern Church on the Western Churches. 5. Lutkens, Two Champions of Ecclesiastical Progress in the Baltic Provinces.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews. Fourth Number.) 1. SACK, On J. J. Spalding as an Author. 2. BAUSMAN, Catechetics. 3. LAURENT, The Epistles of the Apostle Paul. 4. ENGELHARDT, On Mark ix, 9–13.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Scientific Theology. Edited by Prof. Hilgenfeld, of Jena.) First Number, 1862.—1. HILGENFELD, Catholicism and Protestantism, on occasion of the Tercentenary Commemoration of the Council of Trent. 2. LIPSIUS, On the Ophitic Systems. 3. BARMANN, Reply to Dr. Lipsius [on Gnosticism.] 4. GENSLER, The Death-Day of Polycarp of Smyrna, calculated from the cotemporaneous Easter Sabbath. 5. SPIEGEL, Hermann Bonnus [one of the German Reformers of the Sixteenth Century] on the Lord's Supper. 6. HILGENFELD, The Codex Sinaiticus. 7. PAUL, A Reply to Dr. Strauss [on the Resurrection of Jesus.] 8. HILGENFELD, A Postscript to the recent discussion [between Dr. Strauss and Paul] on the Resurrection of Christ. 9. LABES, An Unprinted Apology of Andreas Bodenstein of Carlstadt, relative to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Second Number. 10. HILGENFELD, Dr. Baur's Critical Primitive History of Christianity and its most recent Opponents. 11. EGLI, Hitzig's Commentary to the Psalms. 12. HILGENFELD, The Conversion and Apostolic Vocation of Paul. 13. OVERBECK, The so-called Scholia of Œcumenius on the Revelation. 14. TISCHENDORF, A Correction [to the article of Hilgenfeld in the preceding number of this Journal on the Codex Sinaiticus.] 15. HILGENFELD, Another Remark on the Codex Sinaiticus. 16. EGLI, The Name of the Butterfly among the Hebrews. 17. HILGENFELD, The ἔξοδος of Peter and Paul in Irenæus, advers. hæres. iii, 1, 1.

In the sixth article Professor Hilgenfeld discusses the age of the celebrated Codex Sinaiticus, whose discovery and publication by Professor Tischendorf has made so great a stir in the theological world. The Professor fixed the origin of the Codex in the fourth century, the time of Eusebius, and therefore regards it as even more ancient than the Codex Vaticanus. Hilgenfeld contests the force of the arguments adduced for this assertion. He denies that the beauty and form of the uncial letters points to the fourth century, and remarks that a distinguished paleographist places the writing of the Codex from paleographic reasons, as he [Hilgenfeld] has done from critical, in the sixth century. Tischendorf refers to the peculiar orthography, declension, conjugation, and syntax of the language of the Codex Sinaiticus, which violates all rules of the Greek grammar; but Hilgenfeld insists that such a deviation from the classic Greek might not only have occurred in a later period than the fourth century, but that these very peculiarities of the Codex produce the impression of its having been copied at a time when the knowledge of the classic Greek was declining, and that it is on that account quite plausible that the monks of the monastery of Sinai, which was founded in 536, were the copyists. The weightiest argument for an older origin of the Codex, as Professor Hilgenfeld admits, is the peculiar

arrangement of the books of the New Testament. It places the Epistles of Paul immediately after the Gospels; the Epistle to the Hebrews immediately after the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, that is to say, in the midst of the Epistles of Paul; then the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic Letters, and the Revelation. It also subjoins to the books of the New Testament the Epistle of Barnabas and the Pastor of Hermas. In this arrangement of biblical works it resembles the canon as given by Eusebius, (Church History, iii, 15,) and the one given in the Codex Claromontanus, which arranges the last books of the New Testament as follows: Barnabæ Epistola, Johannis Revelatio, Actus Apostolorum, Pastor (Hermæ,) Actus Pauli, Revelatio Petri. Now, as toward the close of the fourth century the synods of Laodicea (364) and Carthage (397) excluded these *antilegomena* (apocryphal books) from the canon, their reception into the Codex Sinaiticus seems to point to an origin of the Codex before the close of the fourth century. Hilgenfeld tries to invalidate this argument by assuming that the authority of Eusebius, whom Constantine the Great ordered to prepare fifty copies of the Scripture for the Church of Constantinople, may have been for some time so great that even in later times copies of this imperial court Bible were made. He calls attention to the fact that Tischendorf himself states that even in the fifth century the Codex Alexandrinus subjoins the two epistles of Clemens Romanus to the New Testament.

The chief and decisive argument for the later origin of the Codex Sinaiticus Hilgenfeld finds in a postscript to the book of Esther, in which it is stated that this Codex has been carefully compared with another "very ancient" one, which the martyr Pamphilus, who died 309, had corrected. It is argued by Hilgenfeld that this collated Codex of the beginning of the fourth century could not possibly be called very ancient by one who collated it before the middle of the same century. He rejects as inadmissible the assumption of Tischendorf, according to whom the postscript refers to later corrections made in the Codex Sinaiticus. In conclusion Hilgenfeld doubts the assertion of Tischendorf, that the Codex Sinaiticus deserves the first place among the manuscripts of the Bible, not excepting even the Vaticanus.

Professor Tischendorf replies to this argument in the fourteenth article of the Journal for Scientific Theology. The argument for a later origin, which Hilgenfeld had derived from the peculiar language of the Codex Sinaiticus, he demolishes so successfully that Hilgenfeld acknowledges his error. With regard to the testimony of a nameless paleographist which is invoked by Hilgenfeld, he remarks that he cannot accept such a testimony; for while Montfaucon, who hitherto

was regarded as the highest authority in paleography, hardly knew twenty-five uncial manuscripts, he (Tischendorf) had compared in the European and Oriental libraries from two to three hundred and used them for a new "Palæographia Græca," which he intends to publish, and that this number embraces about forty which he discovered in the East, and which had never been used before. He then challenges the authority adduced by Hilgenfeld to produce a single uncial manuscript of the sixth century which has any of the essential characteristics of the Sinaitic manuscript. He also enters into an elaborate defense of his arguments in favor of the early origin of the Codex Sinaiticus, and, among other points, mentions that, according to the testimony of Eusebius and Hieronymus, "nearly all Greek manuscripts," and in particular the "accurate manuscripts," omitted Marcus xvi, 9–20, which are found in all the seven hundred manuscripts which are of a later date than the beginning of the fifth century, and that therefore the omission of these eleven verses in the Codex Sinaiticus is a strong argument in favor of its origin prior to the fifth century.

Professor Hilgenfeld again replies to the articles of Tischendorf, adhering to his view respecting the origin of the Codex in the sixth century.

ZEITSCHRIFT FUR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal of Scientific Theology.) Third Number. 1. ROSENKRANZ, German Materialism and Theology. 2. HILGENFELD, The Gospel of Mark and the Mark-hypothesis. 3. FITZSCHE, On 2 Esdras, i, ii, xv, xvi.

The first article, by one of the noted philosophers of Germany, Professor Karl Rosencranz of Königsberg, gives an interesting and valuable review of the entire materialistic literature, as well as of the works which have been written in refutation of the pretensions of this school. The materialistic school commenced with Ludwig Feuerbach, who in 1830 in his work, "Gedanken eines Denkers über Tod und Unsterblichkeit," (Thoughts of a Thinker on Death and Immortality,) gave the first impulse to understanding by immortality, not existence after death, but the unceasing presence of the idea as the absolute substance in the mind. The same author published subsequently "Das Wesen des Christenthums," (The Essence of Christianity, 1841,) in which he attempted to show that man's representation of God was only his reflection on his own essence; "Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft," (Principles of the Philosophy of the Future, 1843,) in which he declared sensuousness to be the absolute criterion; and "Ueber das Wesen der Religion," (on the Essence of Religion, 1851,) in which nature was declared to be identical with the absolute.

Among the prominent representatives of this school, founded by Feuerbach, the author mentions and reviews Blasche, Michelet, Professor at the University of Berlin, D. F. Strauss, the author of the Life of Jesus, all of whom denied the doctrine of a personal immortality. These views found very ardent and successful champions among a numerous class of writers, who tried to popularize the study of natural sciences. Burmeister, (Geschichte der Schöpfung, 1843,) A. Humboldt, (Kosmos, vol. i, 1845,) Ule, (Weltall, 1850,) B. Cotta, (Letters on the Kosmos,) were among the first and most efficient writers of this school. The latter identified the idea of spirit with that of the brain, and thus inaugurated the phrenological literature of the materialistic school, of which Dr. Scheve of Heidelberg is one of the chief representatives. The investigations of Dubois Raymond, professor in Berlin, on animal electricity, (Ueber die thierische Electricität, 1848,) seemed to dissolve that which had hitherto been thought to be a manifestation of the soul, as a principle independent of matter, into an electrical process. Subsequently the works of Moleschott and Rossmässler gave currency to the idea that the phosphorous contents of the brain contained the thinking substance. Life began to be looked upon as a merely chemical process, and Feuerbach, in a review of Moleschott's Physiologie der Nahrungsmittel, (Physiology of Aliment,) came to the conclusion that "man is what he eats." Karl Vogt, the author of numerous works on zoology, taught expressly that man is only a highly organized class of animals, and that he must follow all his desires and passions. In 1855 L. Büchner, then a lecturer at the University of Tübingen, compiled a systematic and popular compendium of all the fundamental doctrines of the materialistic school, under the title of "Kraft und Hoff," (Force and Matter,) which had an immense circulation, and was in 1862 translated into French, and in 1864 into English. Among other prominent writers of the materialistic school are mentioned Virchow, professor in Berlin, and Czolbe, who maintained not only the eternity of the world, but the eternity of the form in which it at present exists. As the ablest among the numerous writers of the school, Professor Rosenkranz regards Feuerbach, Moleschott, and Vogt.

While the works of the materialistic school are numerous, the literature against them is no less so. As the materialists not only attacked theology, revealed and natural, but also every kind of philosophy, they necessarily called forth the opposition of the ablest representatives of every philosophical school. Among those who wrote against them from the stand-point of the right wing of the Hegelians were Erdmann, Hinrichs, and Schaller. Among the adherents of Herbart, Dr. Taute and Drossbach; among those of Baader, Professor Hoff-

man and Dr. Fabri are mentioned as having attacked the arguments of the materialists. Schopenhauer and his school, though their philosophy is no less atheistical than that of the materialists, belong among the most violent opponents of the latter. The attacks of the materialists upon Christianity were especially repulsed by Richard Wagner, Professor of Natural Sciences at the University of Gottingen, Andreas Wagner, and Frohschammer, Professors at the University of Munich, and many others.

JAHRBUCHER FUR DEUTSCHE THEOLOGIE. (Year-books of German Theology. Third Number.) 1. STEITZ, The Doctrine of the Greek Church concerning the Lord's Supper. 2. FISCHER, Corpus Doctrinæ Hohenloicum. 3. SCHROEDER, On the Book of Revelation.

Dr. Steitz, to whose valuable essays in the theological periodicals of Germany we have had more than once occasion to refer, begins in the first article a history of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Greek Church until the close of the seventeenth century. His treatise will be much more complete than anything that has previously been written on the subject; for even the works of Ebrard, Kahnis, and Ruckert trace the history of the doctrine in the Greek Church only until the eighth century. As the result of his investigations, Dr. Steitz announces that the Greeks did not know transubstantiation until the establishment of the Latin Empire in Constantinople; that the opinion which appears to be akin to transubstantiation, and is found in a number of Greek fathers and writers, deserves rather the name of transformation; that only since the fourteenth century an inclination of the Latin doctrine of the Sacraments, and in particular, the Lord's Supper, is found; but that not until after the negotiations about a union of the Latin and Greek Churches at Florence, transubstantiation, under the name of *μετουσίωσις*, found admittance to the Greek Church. The first installment of Dr. Steitz's essays examines the passages relating to the Lord's Supper which occur in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch, Justinus the Martyr, Irenæus, and the earlier Gnostics.

French Reviews.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—*May* 1.—2. SAINT MARC GERARDIN, The Origin of the Eastern Question, (first article.) 3. RENAN, The Higher Instruction in France, its History and Future. 3. RECLUS, The Sanitary Commission in the War of the United States, 1861 to 1864. 7. GALOS, The Expedition of Cochin China. 9. MAZADE, The Confessions of Father Lacordaire.

May 15.—2. RUI FORGUES, Teheran and Persia in 1863. 5. CALMON, William Pitt, (first article.) 6. UBICINI, Eastern Nationalities—Servia.

June 1.—CALMON, William Pitt, (second article.) 7. GEFFROY, The London Conference.

June 15. 3. PAVIE, The Origin and the Transformation of the French Language. 7. GIQUEL, France in China. 8. MONTALIVET, Reminiscences of the Parliamentary Monarchy of 1830.

July 1.—2. BELEZY, Australia. 5. GUIZOT, Science and the Supernatural. 6. MAZADE, Portugal under King Luiz I. 7. LAUGAL, The Confederate Pirates and the Right of Nations.

ART. X.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Journal of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; held in Philadelphia, Pa., 1864. Edited by Rev. WILLIAM L. HARRIS, D.D. 8vo., pp. 512. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

It is a striking but hitherto unnoticed fact that ours is the only Church whose general ecclesiastical body has established a daily paper to publish and circulate the reports of its debates and measures. We know not how much of a volume embodies the results of other ecclesiastical bodies; but the goodly work before us, wrought by Dr. Harris and his coadjutors, furnishes much ground for pleasant gratulations. It holds the record of many an important measure and the tokens of growing prosperity. It is full of auguries of good for the Church, the country, and the world.

We shall confine our notices to a few important points.

The action of the Church recognizes that our children are children of the Church. She takes *all* obtainable children into her nursery. She recognizes baptized children as initially within the pale of the Church. She only waits the mature and intelligent evidence of a hopeful regenerate character to call them to the communion table. We cordially welcome these movements. We welcome the whole discussion of the "infant question" as sure to result in truth and good. That the Church has in the past rather floated along both in measure and doctrine on this all important point is owing to her vigorous and busy immaturity. Let not our thinking men fear or tremble at the submission of the whole question to what it has never had, a full and fraternal discussion. A large number of our best thinkers hold that while, irrespective of the atonement, man is depraved in his entire nature, yet that the child is met by the atonement at his entrance into life, and placed in a saved state. But that is matter of mere theory. When it comes to the matter of practice we suppose that most of them would esteem the present measure of the General Conference as

quite sufficiently advanced. If we understand those thinkers aright, they would rather fear that it goes too far. They would rather ask a more guarded requirement of explicit evidence of a true religious experience, of a settled regenerate nature, before the final ratification of complete Church-membership. There may be, we have no doubt there are, children who have never been in an unsaved state. It would be a melancholy thing if there were not. It would be a strange Gospel that requires every human being to pass some part of his life in a state of heirship of hell. There are, so far as experience shows, those who "need no conversion;" happy but rare cases, in which Christian nurture and spirit's influences have so blended as to precede and preclude what Mr. Wesley calls the loss "of the grace received in baptism;" or as some would say, the grace received before baptism, of which baptism is but the outward sign and seal. O that Church spirituality and parental piety were strong enough to make this the rule and not the exception! Normally now the evidences of qualification for the full Church profession is through conviction of sin and conversion. Infant regeneration, if it exists, certainly does not secure childhood piety. Our children are not *of course* Christians. Nor, certainly, without the proper evidence are they to be called Christians. Childhood does exhibit often a tenderness of conscience, an eager interest in holy things, a simple realizing faith that makes elder Christianity blush for itself. The repulsive pictures drawn by unflinching theologians of depraved infancy and childhood are often far more applicable to even professing Christian parents, who have mature reason to guide them and so less excuse, than to the child. We shrink from such partial pictures, invidiously selecting certain special evil traits, and assuming that infant piety should be more perfect than adult regeneration. We fully approve, then, the changes of the Discipline that bids us meet our children with a tenderer feeling. Or if we have any exceptions to make, it is to the want of a sufficient demarcation line requiring in more express terms a regenerate character as condition of unqualified Church-membership.

It is matter of just gratitude to Almighty God that, late though it be and after the day of securing a pre-eminently honorable record, it is to be feared, has passed, we have, by Episcopal and General Conference action, inaugurated the exclusion of slavery from the Church. Yet we rejoice with trembling; for slavery is not dead. The powerful old pro-slavery political organism still lives unterrified and fierce for future triumph. Our present chief magistrate has, we trust, committed himself to the enterprise of securing the peace of the country on the basis of freedom. But should defeat attend his re-election or his purpose, and a pro-slavery reascendency prevail; should our bishops

postpone presenting the Church measure to the Annual Conferences, who knows that conservatism might not rally a one fourth vote and defeat a change of General Rule? Yet earnestly *desiring* we shall *trust*. Earnestly desiring the erasure of old party lines and the restoration of the perfect spirit of union, so necessary to religious prosperity, we shall *trust* that the adherence of all is equally firm to the antislavery cause and will equally stand in any future contest. The Church is at the present time suffering the effect of these divisions. Christ, as the advocate of the slave and of holy right, has for the time sent us "not peace but a sword." But for the consequences that follow the battle of Right with Wrong, Wrong, not Right, is to blame. Freedom is not responsible for the evil results of her battle with slavery in Church or State. That battle must last until Righteousness wins. But the maintainers of the Right are wrong if from interested motives they retain a partisan spirit after the ground of necessary division has passed. That is *schism*. And the true prosperity of the Church needs the united strength of ALL. The repairing our old breaches, the building up waste places, the inauguration of new enterprises, all demand the spirit of mutual TRUST, of liberality, of zeal, and of earnest spirituality.

It seems to us a sad oversight that our General Conference made no movement in behalf of the then pending constitutional amendment prohibiting slavery forever. That measure failed by but four votes. Had the three great ecclesiastical bodies, then in session, the Methodist and the two Presbyterian, united in an earnest representation to Congress, who knows but that an opportunity now perhaps lost forever may have been gained? And if we are now, as a single Church, truly and unanimously antislavery, why should not this be the rallying point of Church action? Why should not bishops, conferences, periodicals, Churches and people concentrate their energies upon the attainment of that great measure?

The Lay Convention, though embodying not a little weight of character, was by no means so imposing as a demonstration as its New York predecessor. On the other hand most of the elements of "one-sidedness" had disappeared both in its organization and tone of proceedings. So far from a single antislavery utterance being rudely treated, an organic declaration of antislaveryism was adopted. Its address to the General Conference was excellent in its tone. The convention disused the argument of "rights," and advocated a more popular plan, if we mistake not, than heretofore proposed, of choosing Lay Delegates. We dissent from its positions in but two points. We should prefer a still broader popularity of suffrage for Delegates, and we think they erred in not resubmitting the question to a general

vote of the Church. Our belief is that the great majority of ministry and laity approve the method of making the transition by general Church vote. We believe that a plan could have been formed which, with due discussion, would have secured a large majority, and have ended the matter by the next General Conference.

But the most favorable aspect of the matter is derived from the tone and temper of the General Conference itself. That body would not, we think, have refused to resubmit the question. The action of the various individuals of that body generally ignored all old questions in the discussion of this measure. As representatives of the ministry at large, they furnished the most ample proof that there exists every disposition to concur with the expressed will of the laity upon the subject. The question was re-inaugurated and authoritatively placed for discussion before the Church. We doubt not that, while the existence of any special organs and organizations are very generally regretted, all the official agencies of the Church are perfectly ready for Church-wide, unpartisan, healthful action.

In our article on this subject before the last General Conference, while we pointed out the unacceptable points in the then existing movement, we were very careful to give repeated assurances that, when divested of its one-sided aspects, Lay Delegation should receive our personal vote and acceptance. That "one-sidedness" flung a large body of old antislavery Lay Representationists, for the time being, into a false position. As we then said, the great body of Lay Representationists heretofore have been antislavery men. They were so at a time when "Abolitionism" and Lay Delegationism were the head and tail of "Radicalism." They now found the "movement" monopolized in a very curious way, and themselves completely ignored. They stood firmly aloof for the time; but surely their ultimate position could not be controlled by any movement of their former opponents. They waited for the time, which we trust has now come, for placing themselves on their old principles. The very principles of antislaveryism, favoring as they do the rights of individualism, tend to the assertion that the governed layman should have a share in his own government. Our laity have hitherto yielded that right by consent, as our clergy have abundantly yielded their own rights by consent. We understand the General Conference now very much as saying, "When we understand that a proper majority of the laity desire to withdraw that consent, we approve the concession of those rights by the clergy without standing upon their own 'rights,' in the magnanimous trust that it will conduce to the best good of the Church." Such being the case, we trust that the time has now arrived for the considering of the question and taking our stand simply upon

its own merits. And so considering it, we may now say that our own personal historical antecedents, years ago, so far at least as the testing of its feasibility is concerned, were upon the affirmative side of the question. We have not to take any indorsement from modern organizations. Our representationism is older than their existence.

It is not our editorial province in undue measure to press our personal views upon the Church. The Quarterly, in obedience to what we understand to be the spirit of the action of the General Conference, has been opened to suitable discussion. But we may at the present time note thus much. We believe in a complete self-consciousness and self-activity of the entire body of the Church. No Church since the apostles' days ever accomplished this problem *spiritually* like ours, and it now remains to reach the same result organically. We are now needlessly failing in this respect, and hence a large amount of popular ignorance, indifference, inefficiency in regard to our Church secularities and ecclesiastical movements. A large share of our laity are scarce aware when our General Conference is in session. Our missionary operations are effective because lay co-operation is associated. Our educational interests languish because our laymen enter not into the Church spirit and feel their own Christian honor involved. When the great institutions of the Church become a matter of conscious interest to all her membership, a new vitality will pervade every part. A revival of energy will, we believe, produce a new epoch in our history. The time has come when we can say that we shall rejoice in the day that with a common concurrence shall see a body of true-hearted Methodist laymen, chosen by the pure suffrage of the Church, take their seats as a co-ordinate part of the great Representative Body.

We trust the great questions that have divided Methodism into sectional denominations will soon disappear. Our secessions and divisions have been purely temporal and external. Each part has held fast the theology and the temperament of Methodism. To Episcopacy probably no section will object; and the adoption of Lay Delegation will remove every barrier for a grand reunion. With, then, a broad popular base crowned with an efficient Episcopacy, our reunited Church will be at once the most liberal and the most executive religious denomination existing. If the spirit of living piety shall glow at the heart, what triumphs for the Redeemer may she not win?

A pleasing part of the proceedings of the General Conference was the Addresses of the different delegates from the foreign connections, England and Canada. We trust the time approaches when accredited

brethren from other countries will gladden the general assembly of our Church with fraternal greetings. The passages in the addresses of the foreign conferences touching upon the present rebellion were of course listened to with marked interest. Our English brethren on this subject said:

> Our prayer is, that the God of peace may speedily bring this national strife to a righteous and happy termination, and that the extensive territories of your country may flourish beyond all former measure in temporal and spiritual prosperity. . . . Need we add, that the sentiments which we have often expressed on the evil of slavery, and the importance of its speedy abolition, remain unchanged? Earnestly do we look for the time when that evil shall no longer exist. That time will assuredly come. May we remind you, brethren, that, as Christians, you are called to pursue firm yet wise and pacific counsels, and in the very spirit of the Christianity which you and we profess, to proceed with calm and steady perseverance, entertaining no doubt of the final result when slavery shall be no more.

The Irish conference addresses us in these words:

> From our own public assemblies and family altars fervent supplications will ascend to our heavenly Father that the vexed question of negro slavery—the source of your present trouble—may find a just solution without involving you for a protracted period in that worst of national calamities, a fratricidal war.

The address of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada has these words:

> We deeply sympathize with you in the calamity of civil war which your country is now enduring, and in which you as a Church are no doubt largely sufferers.
> We pray that the interest of true religion may be preserved throughout the whole, and that the Ruler of all events may crown the struggle with peace *which shall be favorable to national unity*, the supremacy of law and order, and the freedom of those who are now enslaved.

The address of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada contains the following explicit and very satisfactory language:

> Our prayers are that *the rebellion*, which is now affecting the whole world, *may be speedily suppressed*, and that God may restore peace to your nation, and give increasing prosperity to the Church of Christ in your afflicted land.

This language assures us that the great Methodist family throughout the world recognizes the true source of our war to be slavery, and desires the attainment of a peace founded upon its destruction. Add to this that not one foreign Church sends a delegate to the Church South, and never has since its secession, and we have ample grounds of perfect satisfaction with the position of Catholic Methodism in regard to our great contest. May the blessing of Almighty God rest upon the great body, and restore the one fallen member to her pure fellowship and unity!

Religious Training of Children in the School, the Family, and the Church. By CATHARINE BEECHER. 12mo., pp. 413. New York: Harper & Brothers: 1864.

Miss Beecher writes to inform us that she finds, in the Episcopal Church, the true theory of educated piety, in distinction from the revival piety of Puritanism and Methodism. To baptize the child and hold him to be a Christian, to train him by catechisms, and forms, and instilled principles to mature profession, as an *of course* Christian, is the true method for all Churches and all the world. Her doctrinal theory (which it is the main purpose of her book to maintain) is unequivocally Pelagian. She holds that every human being born into the world is as innocent and pure *by nature* as the new-made Adam, and that development *of the nature* is the requisite for adult Christianity and salvation. To this view she believes, very mistakenly we think, that the Christian world is gravitating. Within the range of our observation no such tendency exists.

Miss Beecher compliments Wesley and Methodism for their "common sense." To us their common sense appears in this, that they are a living reaction against the nominal Christianity produced by merely baptismal and educated Christianity. We believe much in educational piety; we see nothing wrong in calling a baptized child, in a broad sense of the word, "a Christian;" but we believe it would be a fatal day for the true vitality of Methodism when a fully evidenced justifying faith in Christ is not required in order to a complete Church membership. When Methodism arrives at this point she may as well merge herself into the dead ecclesiasticism from which she rose, for her mission is ended.

Miss Beecher announces that a new development is taking place in the Methodist Episcopal Church, which, she imagines, will result in childhood Church membership. We doubt the newness of the matter she describes. To show how great our advance is, she quotes a passage from Arminius, in which that great doctor taught that infants are by "the covenant comprehended and adjudged in their parents," and so have "sinned" and become "obnoxious to God's wrath." But if she will turn to his works, vol. i, page 318, (American edition,) she will find that by that same covenant there is, in his opinion, a provision of grace in which children are so included, as putative believers, "as not to seem to be obnoxious to condemnation." Both of these views are consistent, and may be correct. Condemned by the covenant in Adam, living children, like believers, may be justified in Christ. If Miss Beecher will turn to Fletcher's Checks, vol. i, page 461, she will find that writer expressly maintaining the doctrine of both the "justification" and the "regeneration" of living infants. In

a note he adds these remarkable words: "Those who start at every expression they are not used to will ask if *our Church admits the justification of infants?* I answer, UNDOUBTEDLY; since her clergy, by her direction, say over myriads of infants, 'We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it has pleased thee to REGENERATE *this infant.*'" He then proceeds to prove that this *regeneration* is antecedent to baptism, and universal. And he instructs us so to construe his mention of "the regeneration of infants," in his Appeal, (a work adopted in our course of ministerial study,) Part V, Inference 7, as designating regeneration unconditional upon baptism, and of course as existing in the case of every *living* infant. So firmly convinced was Fletcher that Adamic depravity does not preclude infant regeneration, that it was in a powerful work in favor of depravity that he maintained such regeneration. If this be a new development, Miss B. may be thus assured it is by no means "a new doctrine." According to Fletcher's interpretation, indeed, our infant baptismal service teaches the same doctrine. Our baptismal Scripture lesson from Mark x, 13, etc., declaring "of such is the kingdom of heaven," teaches, in his view, that infants are truly born of the Spirit as ground of their now being baptismally "born of water." They are to receive the outward sign because they *have received* the inward grace. We say not that these teachings of Fletcher are an article of our Church faith; nor that they are true or false. We only say that they are found in one of the standards which has always been put by our Church into the hands of her young ministers; and such is even there affirmed to be the doctrine of our standing Ritual. If Fletcher's interpretations be true, Miss B. will specially observe, we have been proclaiming living infant regeneration at every infant baptism from the very foundation of our Church. But this Arminian and Fletcherian view is very different from her Pelagian denial of a depravity by nature derived from Adam.

Mr. Wesley's views of the baptismal Scripture lesson were scarce different from Fletcher's. "The kingdom of heaven" there mentioned he held to be the "kingdom set up in the world," (see his comment on Mark x, 14, and Matt. xix, 14,) that is, the regenerate earthly Church; he held that little children "have a right to enter" that kingdom or Church; and that "the members of the kingdom" "are such," that is, "natural" children, or "grown persons of a childlike spirit." That membership he interprets to be not contingent and prospective, but real and present. And yet he believed that no one can be within that kingdom who is not regenerate, (see his note on John iii, 5.) We have then the syllogistic premises: All members of the kingdom of heaven are regenerate; Children are such members; and

then what conclusion a logician like Mr. Wesley would draw we leave others to decide.

In contradiction to Fletcher, Mr. Watson, beyond all question, held, 1. That infants are not justified or regenerate in immediate sequence to their personal existence. 2. That infant regeneration is nevertheless a reality; and, 3. That its becoming actual is limited to dying infants, and, as we understand him, takes place just antecedently to their death. On what texts of Scripture this last limitation is founded we are not informed.

Dr. Fisk's view appears in the following words:

> Although all moral depravity, derived or contracted, is damning in its nature, still, by virtue of the atonement, the destructive effects of derived depravity are counteracted; and guilt is not imputed, until by a voluntary rejection of the Gospel remedy man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his own choice. Hence, although, abstractly considered, this depravity is destructive to the possessors, *yet through the grace* of the Gospel ALL ARE BORN FREE FROM CONDEMNATION. So the Apostle Paul: "As by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."—*Calvinistic Controversy.*

Here we are told that all are born "free from condemnation;" and this freedom from condemnation is identical with the "justification" named by St. Paul. And this freedom from condemnation or justification (not merely a title to contingent prospective justification) is at birth upon each living individual infant; and universal, being in spite of our depravity derived from the atonement. The infant does not wait for death before he is justified. Death, actual or approaching, is no condition of salvation. Whether Dr. F. also believed in infant regeneration, or whether he believed that in the case of infants justification and regeneration could be separated, we know nothing in his writings to decide. During our ten years of personal intercourse with him we never heard him discuss the subject.

In regard to Mr. Fletcher's doctrine of infant justification we remark:

1. No one affirms that the regeneration of an infant, as taught by Fletcher, is psychologically absurd, or contrary to human or Christian consciousness. The doctrine of infant regeneration, either unconditional or conditional upon baptism, is no new doctrine, but has been a dogma in all the great sections of the Church, whether Greek, Catholic, or Protestant. The regeneration of the infant is nothing different in nature from that in the adult, except as modified by its subject; and the use of the term is in both cases equally proper, involving no innovation in theology of either thought or language. If an infant can be depraved it can also be undepraved; if it can be positively unregenerate it can also be regenerate. In the infant nature as truly

as in the adult, there may exist all the potencies, predispositions, and predeterminate tendencies, natural or gracious, for an actual though not responsible moral nature, good or bad.*

2. The doctrine of depravity is neither implicated in nor modified by the doctrine of infant regeneration, whether unconditional or conditioned upon birth, baptism, or death, actual or approaching. In either case the depravity comes from Adam, is by nature, and is equally complete; and, in either case, regeneration comes from Christ and is by grace, being extra to and above nature. The unborn John the Baptist was "filled with the Holy Ghost," (Luke i, 15,) and "leaped" at the approach of the mother of the unborn Saviour. And such cases at once explode the objection of the "manifest absurdity" of "regeneration between conception and birth." Nor is there any more absurdity in the infant being regenerated between conception and birth, than in his being depraved at conception or between conception and birth. And this would seem to finish, too, all the argument about the absurdity of generation and regeneration being simultaneous.

3. If Arminius, Wesley, Fletcher, and Fisk are right in their positions, then the Arminian doctrine of falling from grace must be true. And we see the reason why Calvinists must reject those positions unless they would become Arminians. All who become unregenerate, or unjustified, as Fletcher expresses it, have "sinned away the justification of infants." Or, as Fisk says, the "man makes the depravity of his nature the object of his choice," and not until then is "sin imputed unto him." If there be those happy exceptions, who have evidently not "sinned away the justification of infants," Fletcher would doubtless have held them to be Christians, and at responsible age have

* On this subject Dr. Olin says: "We have scriptural authority for affirming, that, in some instances at least, the Holy Spirit has impressed the characteristics of piety upon children in early infancy, and even from their birth. Such instances may be thought miraculous, but they prove none the less conclusively the *possibility* of divine operations upon children anterior to the development of reason. There is, at least, nothing in the nature of the case to exclude them. Again, we all believe that God's grace renews those infants who die and go to heaven before they know how to discern the right hand from the left. This quite dissipates the philosophical objection; there is no *natural* obstacle to the work of grace in a child. Indeed, when we recollect that conversion has quite as much to do with the heart as with the intellect, and that the affections and moral sentiments of children are developed, and may be variously acted upon and modified in their earliest years, and anterior to the development of the understanding, it is not a little strange that this difficulty should have arisen in thoughtful minds."

And again: "God's grace does not, at least it does not, it is said, *ordinarily*, operate before the mind is capable of exercising faith. This is far from self-evident."

See his beautiful Sermon on Children, published at our Book Rooms.

admitted them to communion. And an Arminian like Fletcher would have no difficulty with our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again," etc.; for he would understand that such words are addressed to all apostates, entirely irrespective of any past experience.

4. From this general apostacy it would arise that our authors describe our general depravity as men and as adults, without a slavish reference in every case to the exceptional point of infant justification. That transient seminal period is left out of account, and a depravity is attributed to men in the gross and the entirety, which is no more contradicted by infant than by adult regeneration. No passage describing depravity in any of our authors is to be quoted as deciding his view of the infant's gracious state, unless the infant status is his proper subject.

5. If infants are by the covenant virtual believers, we see full answer to the Baptist argument against infant baptism. "Believe and be baptized," quotes the Baptist; none but believers are to be baptized. By the covenant, Arminius and Fletcher could have replied, infants are, in the eye of the law, believers. Wesley, in his sermon *On the Education of Children*, describes mankind as natural-born atheists. They are so. Ignorant infancy believes, by nature, neither in God nor in Christ. And yet by the covenant Arminius would tell us they are believers both in God and in Christ. Does any man believe that Wesley in baptizing an infant held himself to be baptizing an atheist? Atheists, he held, dying go to hell. But here, forsooth, is a *baptized*, unbelieving, unjustified, unregenerate atheist; baptized, because "of such is the kingdom of heaven!" Fletcher would doubtless have said that the infant, though by nature an atheist, is by grace a believer in God and Christ.

We have not been arguing the *truth* of the doctrine of infant regeneration, in regard to which the editor of the *Northwestern Advocate* wisely says that thoughtful men are indisposed to "dogmatize;" but analyzing the position of our doctrinal standards, and the relation of those positions to other points of Arminian theology. And we incline to conclude that, judged by those standards, the dissidents from Fletcher have no claim to a credit for special orthodoxy.

Ritual of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Pp. 152. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

The committee whose duty it was to remodel our Ritual has well performed its task. Especially well done are those additions which they entirely originated. It is often a more difficult task to modify

the old than to construct the new. We may make a few suggestions, with which, as individual opinions, our readers are not obligated to agree.

In the marriage ceremony the promise to obey on the part of the bride is quietly omitted. Some of the old clumsy expressions of which the form, though in general beautiful, was singularly full, are still retained. In its opening address the awkward phrase "gathered together here" should be "here assembled." A period should be put at the word "matrimony," and the then next sentence should begin with "This" in place of the present "which." We then might have, by a more careful adjustment, an elegant and easily-remembered sentence in three members ending at "all men." There are several other phrases requiring change. The introduction of the ancient symbolical ring we approve; but the completeness of the symbol should be retained. The ring should originate with the groom; it should be passed through the minister, as the mediator to the bride; it should return through her to the groom, to be placed upon her finger. The circle of entire consent is then beautifully symbolized.

And now that we have this suitable form, let it be always used, and always in the Church. Our ministry have, we fear, sadly concurred to demoralize the public mind by not discountenancing slight, thoughtless, and too little solemn performance of this rite, tending to reduce it to a mere civil contract which an alderman can mediate with a few trifling words. We fear that our people have too slight a conscience, because our ministry have thought too little deeply on the subject. We hope this ancient and yet renovated form will be ever used with an earnest view to an impressive effect.

We regret to see the slightest encouragement given to any mutilation of the Apostles' Creed. Next to the sacred canon this is the most venerable of documents. What call for the foot-note at page 23? The term *catholic* has become embodied in the creed in all the languages of Christendom. It is paying a poor compliment to the intelligence of our people to suppose they do not understand it, a still poorer compliment to the character of our instructions. We do not suppose that our laity are likely to become Baptists unless we erase the title of John the Baptist, or to become Presbyterians unless we expurgate the word *presbytery* from the New Testament. If the Romanists make a handle of the word it is a very poor one; and their handle of it is rather improved than obviated by our undertaking to slur it. The more effectual way, if any is needed, to neutralize all Romish argument, is to appropriate the word to its true use, and withhold its specific application to a particular denomination. But even this we think unnecessary. We do not withhold the term Uni-

tarian from a particular sect, lest we should thereby concede to them the sole maintenance of the divine unity. We do not disparage our own baptism by calling another sect Baptists. We do not deny all method to other denominations by calling ourselves Methodists. No more do we concede all the catholicity to Romanists because we call them Catholics. We trust that no minister will in the utterance mutilate the Apostles' Creed.

We may be excused for adding that we should greatly desire the addition of a portion of Psalms, to be responsively read in the Sabbath morning service. This ancient and scriptural practice should never be abandoned for our present purely puritanic nakedness. Herein we stand for the privilege of our laity. We maintain the "laymen's rights" to their share in the sacred service. The whole service is now with the minister; nothing but patient waiting and hearing with the congregation. A responsive Psalter, an audible simultaneous utterance of the Lord's prayer, and congregational singing, are three desiderata to add life and full communion to our Sabbath service. Congregational singing could at least take place in the third hymn, if it were made the duty of the chorister to give at that time a hymn familiar to the congregation. We should prefer at that singing a tune consecrated by time and redolent with associations of the prayer-meeting poured forth "lustily," deluging the congregation with its own song of praise to Jehovah. If the congregation would sing loud enough to drown our voice completely, we should even dare to sing ourself!

Foreign Theological Publications.

Evangelische Glaubenslehre nach Schrift und Erfahrung. Von HERMANN PLITT. Gotha, 1863, Vol. I, pp. 443; 1864, Vol. II, pp. 416. 4 thaler.

In March, 1778, SPANGENBERG issued, in the name of the Moravian Brotherhood, the "*Idea Fidei Fratrum*," the first Moravian System of Divinity. Hermann Plitt, Professor in the Moravian Theological School at Gnadenfield, now issues, in his own name, the second. The two works, as they lie here upon the table before us, present a curious contrast. The one is small and dingy, and ill printed; the other clear, ample, and spotless, from the famous press of PERTHES. The one direct, simple, ready to break out on every occasion in praise or exhortation; the other dignified, precise, philosophical. The one gives us a preacher's thoughts about the Christian religion; the other the ripe results of the trained academician. Still, the contrast admits of an equally striking similarity; for almost exactly as Spangenberg's book was related to the Lutheran theology of his day, so is Plitt's to

the orthodoxy of our time. That is to say, it is substantially identical with the type of doctrine prevailing among the more evangelical and "believing" party of "the Church," only warmer-toned, vitalized, and set forth with sole reference to the Bible and Christian experience.

Perhaps the most noticeable feature of the work is the support it gives to the theory of annihilationism. Few German theologians have deemed this notion worthy of any extended notice in their treatises of systematic theology. Some omit it entirely, others mention it only to briefly refute it by a passage or two of Scripture. Hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of theologians and preachers in Germany have abandoned the old orthodox view, but not a half dozen since the Reformation have advocated annihilationism. Our author is not at all bold and dogmatic upon the point, but merely represents the theory as an "object of Christian hope." He acknowledges that there are almost insuperable difficulties in the way of exegetically establishing it, and contents himself with showing that the doctrine does no *greater* violence to the Scriptures than the so common belief in restorationism. So far as the *biblical argument* is concerned, the strictest believer will agree with him, we think, that the view is *better* supported than that of the Restorationists. Its philosophical argument, however, is weaker. But we are old-fashioned enough to deny that we are shut up to any such dilemma. However it may be with other types of doctrine, Methodism can believe in an eternal penal woe without doing violence to any perfection of God. It is a suspicious circumstance that Plitt winds up his discussion with a caution against *preaching* the new doctrine. The preacher must stick to the plain word of God. He is advised, therefore, in the last sentence of the book, on the one hand not to deal too largely in threats of hell-fire, but on the other to feel no delicacy in warning the sinner of his danger of "damnation," using the term by a kind of mental reservation to denote "absolute exclusion from the life-communion of God to all eternity." Comment is unnecessary. What God has revealed he designs to have published. Secret things belong to him, but the revealed, not to the theologians and preachers, but "to us and to our children." If he has told us that the devil and all his angels and wicked men are to be annihilated, it is the preacher's duty to tell men so; if he has declared a different fate, that is to be preached. The watchmen must not shun to declare all the counsel of God. The effect of believing one thing and seeming to preach another, of declaring a pretended "revealed will of God," yet furtively holding to a contrary "secret will," must be anything but beneficial to the preacher, and it is a pity it cannot remain an exclusive glory of old-fashioned Calvinism.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

First Principles of a New System of Philosophy. By HERBERT SPENCER. 12mo., pp. 508. New York: Appleton & Co. 1864.

The name of Herbert Spencer has within a brief period past acquired a rapid celebrity in the world of thought. There can be no denying that he possesses unusual powers of intellect, powers which are perhaps destined to leave permanent traces upon future opinions. His speculations are not only bold in character, but bold in the comprehensiveness of their range; including in their vast scope a grand system of physics, metaphysics, psychology, biology or science of life, and sociology. What that system is can be no matter of indifference to our readers; for, without professing any such aim, it is destructive to theology and religion not only as they at present exist, but in all forms, finally and forever. That destruction takes place not so much by direct polemics, as by the positive establishment of necessary science excluding them from existence.

To give some idea to our readers of his system as developed in the present volume, we will in some degree reverse his own order, and treat first of his physical or cosmological philosophy and then of his metaphysical.

Force is demonstrated to be *persistent*, that is, indestructible. The same amount is always in existence, either manifest or latent. Motion is the action or manifestation of force; space and time are the conditions in which motion takes place. As matter manifests itself only as force, so the indestructibility of force includes the indestructibility of matter. This indestructibility is grounded in the absolute, and so is "persistent" for all the past and the future.

Motion, whether of body or mind, is in the direction of least resistance. Mental operations are in fact like physical, a term in a series of causations, produced by the same forces, and according to the same laws, and effecting the same results. And all movement, material, mental, social, is governed by one great law, namely, that the original crude and indiscriminate mass shoots out into manifold particularities. Assuming the nebular hypothesis as true, the primordial matter develops into an illimitable variety of multiplicities which result in the present complicated and still complicating system of things. Crude ignorance in the individual thus develops into manifold and delicate refinements; crude barbarism in the mass into civilization with its infinite variety of ramifications. This process is much elucidated by one great law of causation, called by Mr. Spencer the law of Evolution, namely, that *of every single cause the effects*

are manifold. As the brittle lump under the stroke of the hammer disperses its fragments in a thousand directions, so of every single cause the effects flare out into infinite multiplicities. Under power of this universally developing law through ages, the massy and the indefinite are emerging into the most definite and delicate particularities. Avoiding the terms as teleogical in their import, Mr. Spencer would have us recognize that all going under the names of *progress*, *advancement*, *improvement*, *refinement*, are hereby explained as taking place under strictly necessary and irrespective Law. Next comes the consideration of the Instability of the Homogeneous. All masses, organic and inorganic, are undergoing the unequal operations of force upon their different exterior parts, as well as different amounts upon interior and exterior, by which, slowly yet surely, all undergo disintegration. All aggregates are crumbling. Nevertheless, under urgency of persistent force, agitating and diffusing through all things, the ultimate result will be an equalization. Force and matter will by necessary laws be so distributed that the struggle will balance and complete repose ensue. In the ultimate a final *equilibration* will take place; a universal stagnation, an omnipresent death. This process he assumes to demonstrate, basing its proof on self-evident truths. Of this death whether there will be any resurrection he modestly declines to affirm. But he conjectures that the *finale* will be a melting back into the original nebula; and then a new Evolution of the same kind will take place. And so the universe may revolve through an endless succession of cycles, urged by the power of ever "persistent Force."

So far we have stated, very imperfectly, Mr. Spencer's theory of the universe; now for his metaphysico-theological theory.

All knowledge is relative and phenomenal; but underlying these relations and phenomena is an unknowable Absolute. Of this absolute the universe and all its changes are "forms," "manifestations," etc. To ascribe to this absolute *intelligence* is a mere humanizing conception. The absolute may for aught we know possess not intelligence, but some inconceivably higher nature. The great merit of all religion past and future is its maintaining through all ages the existence of this Absolute. This pure, simple element, the faith in the existence of the unknowable absolute, is the sole truth in all religions from the grossest fetichism to the purest monotheism. Religion and science will arrive at complete reconciliation when science shall cease to conjure up causalities and substances, and confine herself to relations; and when religion will renounce her revelations, her invisible personalities, and her rituals and worships, and shrink to a simple recognition of the Unknowable. Mr. Spencer rejects with indignation

Mansell's compromise, recognizing the acts and attributes of God as true for us but not true in the absolute. Yet he holds that these spurious additions which religion, constantly but *diminuendo*, gathers around the pure Absolute idea, are temporarily allowable and justifiable as best in their day. But the scientist and the philosopher are playing their proper part in trimming those additions to ever narrowing dimensions preparatory to the reduction to the pure idea of the Unknowable.

Mr. Spencer earnestly rejects all identification with Comte. The former treats religion with respect; while the latter takes his stand upon positive science as the sole totality of valid knowledge, and rejects all metaphysics or theology as vapory nothings, with silent contempt. But the difference between them appears to us an essential *nothing*. Mr. Spencer takes a single metaphysical dogma, the bare affirmation of an underlying unknowable Absolute, and a very doubtful one at that, and sets it apart to be called and respectfully treated as Religion, while he treats with plentiful though patronizing sneer all that claims to be religion besides. Give us Comte's frank contempt rather than Mr. Spencer's impudent condescension.

A slight examination of Mr. Spencer's Psychology, not yet published in this country, induces us to anticipate that his greatest service to truth will be achieved in that domain. If we mistake not he possesses a critical and metaphysical style of mind which will make its mark in the science of thought.

It is fair for us to say, that while the Introduction to the present volume expresses the enthusiastic expectation that "Mr. Spencer is to find his largest and fittest audience" among "the young men of our country," he hails in England from the ranks of the Westminster Review section, and is sternly pronounced "an atheist" by even the rationalistic National. Those benevolent spirits, then, who hopefully look to our country as the source of a future Atheistic millennium, may rightly hail Mr. Spencer as "the coming Man." It is also fair for us to add, that, in our view, Mr. Spencer's theology is perfectly separable from his Physical Theory. His theory possesses a mechanical lumbering character which repels the imagination, and a dreary vastness which chills the heart. His Universe is an awful tenement to inhabit. It is not until it is warmed and cheered by a living, ruling God that we can feel safe, or can make it an endurable home. We therefore deal very unceremoniously with Mr. Spencer's almighty Dead-Head, yclept the Absolute. An unintelligent absolute is an infinite Fool, and fools be they who accept its supremacy.

The range of Mr. Spencer's philosophy, as yet to be published, is

vast and comprehensive. Two volumes on Biology, or the Science of Life, are to show how spontaneous unintelligent causes, grounded upon the unknowable base, wind nature through the complexities of Physiology, regulating the process of growth and forms, and evolving production and generation. Two volumes on Psychology are to show how Life graduates into Mind, and trace the transitions from nervous conditions to consciousness. Three volumes on Sociology are to trace the Laws whence social, ecclesiastical, and other organizations take origin among the living beings whom under the name of Man we find lodged upon our planet in its transition through the present temporal cycle from nebula to nebula, as well as the Lingual, Intellectual, Æsthetic, and Ethical progress through which the race is navigated by necessary and unintelligent Law. Two volumes, finally, are to deduce the principles of all ethics from the temporal well-being of the race. Thus the entire system of the Universe, both physical and mental, is to be revealed and demonstrated as based on absolute and inherently necessary laws and causes by the transcendant genius of Mr. Spencer. A library is to roll forth from his brain which is to be an outline of the Universe.

Freedom of Mind in Willing; or, Every Being that Wills, a Creative First Cause. By Rowland G. Hazard. Pp. 456. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 443 and 445 Broadway. London: 16 Little Britain. 1864.

This is a new and, in many respects, original work on the old and mighty theme. Ostensibly treating of the Will, it really enters into an extensive discussion of human nature, interweaving collateral topics, such as the nature of matter and of spirit, considered as cause, instinct, habit, etc. The handling of those side-themes, involving manifold moral and metaphysical discussions, is thorough and thoughtful, if not always satisfactory, yet frequently retards the progress of the work, and unnecessarily taxes the reader's attention. The style is generally clear, though occasionally somewhat involved and repetitious.

Book I gives us the author's view, with arguments in its favor, elaborated through fifteen chapters. Book II, in thirteen chapters, is devoted to a review of Edwards.

The leading position of the author is set forth in the title on the first page: "Freedom of Mind in Willing; or, Every Being that Wills, a Creative First Cause." At the outset he shows that the "combination which each individual calls 'I'" is made up of "knowledge, thought, sensation, emotion, want, and effort." Knowl-

edge, sensation, and emotion are independent of will, though will may bring about the conditions favorable to their production. Knowledge is "a simple mental perception," all efforts after knowledge being but endeavors to clear the way for such perception. Feeling, whether in sensation or emotion, is not a faculty but a susceptibility; memory, judgment, reasoning, imagination, conception are but names of different forms of knowledge, or of modes of mental action to acquire or reproduce it. Effort to produce such changes, internal or external, such as will bring any of these different kinds of knowledge within the mind's view, is an act of the faculty of will. So the names of the supposed faculties of reasoning, imagination, etc., do but designate varied acts of will. The mind has but one real *faculty*, the will. "Will is the power or faculty of the mind for effort." "The willing, or act of will, is the condition of the mind in effort, and is the only effort of which we are conscious."

What our author designates "*want*," occupies a prominent place in his theory. This is an essential prerequisite to effort; the mind will make no effort, put forth no volition to do anything that it does not *want* done. Want and knowledge he shows to be essential to volition. "Without want, the mind would have no object to accomplish by effort; without knowledge, it would have no means of directing its efforts to the accomplishment of that object." Without want and knowledge the mind would be no cause, or only a blind cause, like matter. Knowledge enables the mind to form preconceptions of the effects of willing, of the changes in the future to be produced by effort; and this prophetic view, spreading before the mind the results of action, fits it to be a *first cause*. Drawn by inducements before it, it does not need propulsion from behind. Acting from its own perception of the effects of its action upon its own wants, it needs no extraneous force to insure action. Want is essential to action, but it is immaterial to the action how that want arose. Not the motives that precede, but the effects that succeed the action, lying in the mind's view, move it to exert its causal influence, and so, up to the point of effort, mind is a *first cause*, an independent power.

There are only three conceivable modes of influencing the mind of another in willing, and these are reducible to two, of which the first is willing *in the stead* of the mind so controlled, an influence inconsistent with any exercise of will when words are used in their proper sense. The second mode is by changing the knowledge, including the knowledge of those feelings which are elements of want, so that in consequence of this change the mind may will freely. But this second mode can be effective only in case the mind wills freely. So that whether mind in willing is influenced by something extrinsic or not, in

either case it wills freely. The author's whole treatment of this subject will be found fresh and suggestive.

In Book II the author makes a thorough and often successful search for flaws in Edwards's armor. He is especially successful in tracking out and following up the fluctuations and ambiguities of the celebrated "Inquirer" in the use of important words, such as "motive," "choice," "necessity." We think that he overdoes (as does Bledsoe) in reducing Edwards's whole doctrine of motives to the bald-truism, "whatever is a motive, is a motive." Although passages can be quoted from the inquiry which give ample foundation for such a criticism, and furnish fair specimens of circular reasoning, yet such reply does not completely answer Edwards's argument. The author shows also that Edwards's doctrine of motives involves an infinite series as much as the self-determining theory of the freedomists.

In the chapter on foreknowledge the author fully admits the claim of the necessitarian, namely, that the prescience of volitions would involve their necessitation. Man wills under the impression that he can make some change in the future, and if his volitions are foreseen, says Mr. Hazard, this impression is an illusion. [How an illusion we cannot understand, for what difference can it make to him whether any being knows anything about it or not?] His theory of the divine government is, in brief, that God sees, in his infinite knowledge, all the possible results of all possible volitions in all beings, and arranges his plans accordingly. The author ingeniously illustrates his theory from an imaginary automatic chess-board, on which each square covers a spring to be operated by the gravitation of the piece there stationed, the springs and men being so adjusted, that for any given move made by, say a black rook or pawn, the best possible move will be made automatically on the other side; so that a person playing against the white would be sure to be checkmated eventually. Such a piece of mechanism is conceivable, and it is also conceivable, he argues, that the Divine Being has so constructed the universe as to be constantly prepared for all possible volition of created beings. The author does not attempt to reconcile this theory of foreknowledge (or lack of foreknowledge) with the Scripture predictions.

The work is written in a calm philosophical spirit, wholly free from controversial sharpness, avoids hackneyed phraseology, is sometimes dull or wearisome, but to the reader really interested in the theme gratifying by its profundity and suggestiveness. N.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Savage Africa: being the Narrative of a Tour in Equatorial, South-western, and North-western Africa; with Notes on the Habits of the Gorilla; on the Existence of Unicorns and Tailed Men; on the Slave-Trade; on the Origin, Character, and Capabilities of the Negro; and of the Future Civilization of Western Africa. By W. Winwood Reade. 8vo., pp. 452. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1864.

This is one of the Harpers' extensive series of books on Africa, all of which are valuable; some scientific in their just pretensions, and others more remarkable for travelers' zest than for profound observation. Mr. Reade belongs to the class of gay and jaunty travelers who may not add largely as Barth to science, but who contrive to be decidedly more readable. He claims that if he has "any merit, it is that of having been the *first young man about town* to make a *bona fide* tour in Western Africa—to travel in that agreeable and salubrious country with no special object and at his own expense; to *flâner* in the virgin forest; to flirt with pretty savages, and to smoke his cigar among cannibals." Graver readers will infer, correctly, that Mr. Reade has several loose screws. He evidently imagines that he is a believer in Darwin; takes care to let us know, incidentally, that he carries Voltaire's Philosophical Dictionary as a pocket fellow-traveler, and furnishes a variety of flippancies to match. Among his *opinions*, so called, he thinks that beyond all question "Africa will be redeemed:" not by colonization, for that is a humbug; not by Christian missions, for they are a failure; but "by a religion;" yes, "by the Mohammedan religion." This gives them just what they need: abstinence from liquors, gravity of character, heroism, and polygamy. Africa will be redeemed, for England will take one half, and France the other. The swamps, the miasmas, the forests will all be removed by the labors of her children, who will "possibly be exterminated" in the process by that "beneficent law of nature that the weak must be devoured by the strong." Yet Mr. Reade has after his order produced a spicy book, and it is likely to be, deservedly or not, one of the most popular of the series.

Educational.

Appleton's Mathematical Series: An Elementary Arithmetic. By G. P. Quackenbos, A. M. Upon the basis of the works of George R. Perkins. 12mo., pp. 144. New York: Appleton & Co. 1864.

The First Three Books of Xenophon's Anabasis: With Explanatory Notes, and References to Hadley and Kühner's Greek Grammars, and to Goodwin's Greek Modes and Tenses, a copious Greek-English Vocabulary,

and Kiepert's Map of the Retreat of the Ten Thousand. By JAMES R. BOISE, Professor in the University of Michigan. 12mo., pp. 268. New York: Appleton & Co. 1864.

A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges. By ALBERT HARKNESS, Ph.D., Professor in Brown University. 12mo., pp. 355. New York: Appleton & Co. 1864.

Professor Harkness aims in this work concisely to state underlying principles as well as facts, and to bring his treatment of the entire subject down to the latest results of philological investigation. Typography is skillfully made to aid in the analysis of forms. The Professor's books are the result of ripe scholarship and practical experience as a teacher.

Progressive Lessons in Greek for the use of Beginners. By WILLIAM B. SILBER, A. M., New York Free Academy. 12mo., pp. 79. New York: Appleton & Co. 1864.

Professor Silber's little manual is an admirable and easy opening of the mysteries of the Greek language, preparatory and adjusted to the grammars of Sophocles, Hadley, and Crosby. We recommend it to pupil and teacher.

Belles-Lettres and Classical.

Love in Marriage. An Historical Study. Lady Rachael Russell. By GUIZOT. Translated from the French by MARGUERITE O. STEVENS. 16mo., pp. 159. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1864.

"The demand of the present day is for romances. But why do we not search history for them?" Such is the language with which the eloquent Christian philosopher and statesman Guizot commences this beautiful leaflet from English history. It is a leaflet which illustrates that truth is sometimes stranger than fiction, and often richer in true interest and inspiring example. To the ladies of our Church and country let us say, that they have here a portraiture drawn from life, and in a great degree by her own hand, of one of the noblest of her sex, a model which none can study without feeling her own nature ennobled. At the same time the rank, intellect, piety, and sorrows of Lady Russell give a romantic interest to her history.

The narrative is constructed by the illustrious author with exquisite skill. Mrs. Stevens's pen has transferred it into the most graceful English. Carlton & Porter have presented it with their best style of typography. It should be in the hands of every woman who aspires to the formation of a noble Christian character.

Periodicals.

The Continental Monthly: Devoted to Literature and National Policy. 8vo., pp. 120. New York: J. F. Trow.

The Continental in its present hands is an organ for very able discussions in national policy, law, literature, and science. It takes large and progressive views of public affairs, and well deserves an extensive circulation.

In the September number there is a brief article on the Antiquity of Man, which suggests that the creation of Adam in the first chapter of Genesis is a different creation and long anterior to that of the second chapter. The former is of a far inferior order; being simply the attainment in the creative series to the supreme *type*—the "image of God"—but not to the being inspired with the divine immortal breath described in the second chapter. The former earthly specimens of the type are now being exhumed by geologists, and traditions of their existence are still extant in the old mythologies. But the Adam of Eden, the primal type of perfect yet fallible humanity, destined in a wonderful future to be even the shrine of a resident divinity, is but a late attainment in the creative progress.

That there is nothing in a fair Scripture exegesis to exclude the belief that the Edenic Adam is a late term in a series of creative progress was affirmed, we believe, by that very original thinker, Professor Tayler Lewis in his work on Mosaic Cosmogony, written before the late geologic developments from which our savans are inferring the antiquity of the human form in creation.

Sunday-School Publications.

Carlton & Porter have issued:

Adventures of a Missionary; or, Rivers of Water in a Dry Place, being an Account of the Introduction of the Gospel of Jesus into South Africa, and of Moffat's Missionary Labors. Eight Illustrations. Large 16mo., pp. 295, purple and gold.

A Happy New-Year. Three Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 142.

Legends of New England. Four Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 171.

Helen Maurice; or, The Daughter at Home. Six Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 247.

The Christmas Bracelet. Three Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 166.

Down in a Mine; or, Buried Alive. Five Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 189.

The Weed with an Ill Name. Three Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 194.

Archie's Dream. Four Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 140.

Shooting at a Mark. A Story for Boys. Four Illustrations. 18mo., pp. 194.

Little Fanny and Other Stories. Square 12mo., pp. 108, crimson and gold.

Miscellaneous.

The Early Dawn; or, Sketches of Christian Life in England in the Olden Time. By the Author of "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." With Introduction by Prof. HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., 12mo., pp. 397. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1864.

This is a book of singular beauty and interest. The author possesses a rare power of reproducing in imaginative narrative the scenes of past history. And while the reader is charmed by the fascination of the work, the impressions produced possess both a moral and historic value. We specially commend it to our readers, and we doubt not that those who have read it will be anxious to procure the Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family, noticed in our last Quarterly, a work in which the times of Luther are portrayed by the same hand as the early days of English Christianity are in this.

The Ferry-Boy and the Financier. By a Contributor to the "Atlantic." Tenth Thousand. 12mo., pp. 332. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1864.

A popular biography of one of our ablest and purest statesmen, Salmon P. Chase. It should be well read by young America.

A Memoir of Dr. Chalmers. By Rev. Dr. FRANCIS WAYLAND. 12mo., pp. 218. Gould & Lincoln.

The moral and intellectual greatness of Chalmers is, we might say, overwhelming to the mind of the ordinary reader. Dr. Wayland draws the portraiture with a master hand.

Pea Ridge and Prairie Grove; or, Scenes and Incidents of the War in Arkansas. By WILLIAM BAXTER. 24mo., pp. 262. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock. 1864.

Mr. Baxter's sketches from life are vivid, and enable us very clearly to realize the exciting scenes he describes.

Visions in Verse; or, Dreams of Creation and Redemption. 12mo., pp. 282. Boston: Lee & Shepherd.

The American Republic in Prophecy. By Rev. GEORGE S. PHILLIPS. 12mo., pp. 236. Cincinnati: Poe & Hitchcock, (for the Author.) 1864.

Carlyle's Frederick the Great. In four volumes. Vol. 4. 12mo., pp. 510. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Pamphlets.

The Right or the Wrong of the American War. A Letter to an English Friend. Second Edition. 8vo., pp. 28. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1864.

The letter, written apparently by a gentleman of the legal profession, is clear, calm, and forcible. It contains, however, strictures, eminently unjust, upon the original Abolitionists; a set of men who, whatever may have been their faults, saved our country from the restoration of slavery to her ancient universality. The writer is less earnest than we could wish for the entire abolition of that source of all our woes. Deep as is our dissatisfaction with the inefficiency and irresoluteness of Mr. Lincoln, the single fact of his placing himself on the platform of peace only by emancipation renders his re-election absolutely requisite to our future well-being. To those who clamor that the destruction of slavery is not the object of the war, we reply: If the object of our war be to suppress rebellion and restore peace, then its object is to destroy slavery; for these are one and the same thing. While slavery lasts, peace cannot be.

The Trinitarian Faith. A Sermon. By Rev. J. H. Wythe, Powell-street Methodist Episcopal Church, San Francisco, California.

A Christian Nation's Ordeal. A Fast-day Sermon. By B. H. Nadal, D.D., Pastor of Wesley Chapel, Washington, D. C.

United States Christian Commission for the Army and Navy for 1863. Second Annual Report.

Second Annual Report of the New England Freedman's Aid Society. (Educational Committee.) Boston. Society's Office, 8 Studio Building, Tremont-street.

We are careful to give the address for obtaining copies of this valuable report.

New Plottings in Aid of the Rebel Doctrine of State Sovereignty. Mr. Jay's Second Letter on Dawson's Introduction to the Federalist, exposing its Falsification of the History of the Constitution, its libels on Duane, Jay, Hamilton, etc. New York, 121 Nassau-street.

Received too late for notice in this number:

Professor Green's Hebrew Chrestomathy, from John Wiley.

Dewart's Canadian Poets, John Lovell, Montreal.

Greeley's History of the American Rebellion. 8vo., pp. 648. Hartford: Case & Co.

INDEX.

Alcock, R.: Capital of the Tycoon....Page 176
Alger: History of the Doctrine of a Future Life..... 237
American Presbyterian and Theological Review 145, 326, 500, 665
—— Quarterly Church Review, 144, 327, 500, 664
—— War, Right or Wrong of the..... 700
Ansted: Great Stone Book of Nature, The. 171
Anthony, St., etc. (*See* Saints of the Desert.)
Antipodes, Our 454
Australia, location and size of..... 455
Discovered and claimed..... 456
Settled by convicts..... 457
The commencement of grazing..... 459
The enterprise of Mrs. Chisholm..... 461
Its land system, government, etc..... 462
Explorations of its interior..... 465
Its climate, fauna, and agricultural resources 474
Its mineral wealth, etc..... 477
Antiquity of Man, The..... 41
Fossil human remains..... 41
Danish peat and shell mounds..... 42
Swiss lake dwellings 43
Alluvial plain of the Nile..... 46
Valley of the Somme..... 48
Cave evidence 53
The pre-Adamite man..... 55
Arithmetic 233
Its early rise..... 234
Its system of notation..... 235
Older writers 237
Provisional notation..... 238
Other improvements..... 240

Bangs, Nathan, Life of..... 172
Barnes, W.: Lay Representation Unscriptural, etc..... 855
Baxter: Pea Ridge and Prairie Grove..... 699
Beecher, C.: Redeemer and Redeemed.... 342
—— Religious training of Children..... 682
New development in the M. E. Church.. 682
Views of Wesley, Fletcher, etc..... 683
Falling from grace..... 685
Beecher, Lyman, Autobiography of..... 348
Bengelii Gnomon..... 163
Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, 144, 327, 501
Bibliotheca Sacra.....145, 328, 501, 665
Blenheim, the Battle of..... 419
Previous history of the government of France 421
Previous history of the government of England 425
Philosophy in the two kingdoms..... 428
Religion in the two kingdoms..... 431
The conflict and its results..... 434
Bolse: Xenophon's Anabasis..... 696
Boston Review.....144, 868, 667
Böttcher: Zum Alten Testament..... 498
Braunfels: Der Nibelungen Noth..... 619
British American, The..... 177
British and Foreign Evangelical Review, 148, 330, 669
British Quarterly Review.....149, 331, 503, 670
Broken Columns..... 180

Browne, Sir Thomas.....Page 294
Character and family..... 295
Criticisms on his writings..... 296
Outside influences..... 299
Extracts from his Religio Medici..... 300
Extracts from his Urn Burial..... 305
Brownson's Quarterly Review.....146, 327, 502
Buchanan: Analogy a Guide to Truth and to Faith..... 322
Bunting, J., Sermons by..... 345

Calvinism, Unauthorized, of the English Bible..... 380
The word "ordain"..... 381
"Carnal"..... 387
"Elect"..... 389
"Such as should be saved"..... 391
1 Peter ii, 8, and 1 Sam. ii, 25..... 392
"Shall" and "Will"..... 392
Words in italics..... 393
Carlyle: Frederick the Great 699
Caro: L'Idee de Dieu et ses Nouveaux Critiques 499
Chalmers, Memoirs of, by Dr. Wayland.... 699
Chesebro, C.: Peter Carradine..... 180
Childs: National Almanac..... 531
Christian Remembrancer.....147, 330, 500, 670
Christology 478
The doctrine of Jesus 479
—— of the Logos 480
—— of Christ..... 481
His divine nature 483
Distinction of characteristics..... 484
Did the divine nature suffer? 487
Necessary characteristics of a substitute.. 488
Chrysostom, Œuvres de..... 144
Clark: Man All Immortal..... 515
Clark: Outline of the Elements of the English Language..... 178
Colenso on the Pentateuch..... 322
—— Bishop, the case of..... 660
Continental Monthly, The 698
Coxe: Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough 419
Craik, G. L.: Compendious History of English Literature..... 852
Cunningham: Review of Bishop Simpson's Address before the Lay Convention.. 355
Cutler, H. B.: Jottings from Life 338
Cutman: Die Christliche Ethik..... 498

Dana: Text-book of Geology..... 347
Daniel, Authenticity of the Book of..... 322
Danville Review.....500, 664
Dawson, H. B.: The Federalist..... 351
Delitzsch: Biblischer Commentar..... 521
Dempster, John, D.D..... 357
Early life, conversion, and education..... 359
Early ministerial life..... 361
Mission to Buenos Ayres..... 362
Interest in Biblical Institutes..... 363
His death..... 366
The style of his Christian zeal..... 367
Peculiarities of experience..... 368
Peculiarities of character..... 370
As a student and preacher..... 373

Dempster, John, D.D.:
As a logician....Page 875
Loyalty to the Church.... 877
—— Lectures and Addresses.... 518
Dobbins: Bible against Slavery.... 856
Dorpater Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.... 670
Draper: History of the Intellectual Development of Europe.... 164

Early Dawn, The.... 699
Early Methodism and Early America: James Watt and John Wesley.... 256
Watt's difficulties.... 258
The peculiarities of the American settlements.... 258
Influence of religious freedom.... 260
—— of Watt and Fulton.... 262
—— of Methodism.... 264
Inception and peculiarities of Methodism 267
Genius of Methodism.... 271
Spread of Methodism.... 274
Introduction of Methodism into America 276
Edinburgh Review....147, 331
Ebrard, J. H. A.: The Gospel History.... 846
Emotional Element, the, in Hebrew Translation, (fourth article).... 57
The abrupt infinitive.... 57
—— used in Isaiah xxi, 5.... 60
The Burden of the Desert of the Sea.... 62
Foreshadowing of Belshazzar's feast.... 63
The Burden of Dumah.... 66
The vision of Eliphaz.... 68
Peculiar use of the future form of the verb.... 74
Episcopal visitation, plan of.... 180
Evangelical Quarterly Review....827, 500
Evangelical Theory of Education.... 161
Every-Day Philosopher, in Town and Country.... 179

Felice: Histoire des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Reformées de France.... 499
Ferry Boy, the, and the Financier.... 699
Flanigan: History of New South Wales.... 454
Floy, James, D.D.... 111
Birth, education, and conversion.... 112
Entrance into the ministry.... 113
Involved in abolition agitations.... 114
Accusation and trial.... 115
Influence of the slave power.... 119
Elected Conference Secretary and delegate to General Conference.... 124
Appointed on committee to prepare the new hymn book.... 125
Elected Editor of National Magazine and Corresponding Secretary of Tract Society.... 126
Ministerial and religious character.... 127
Writings.... 129
Labors on the hymn book.... 131
Power in debate.... 135
Sudden death.... 136
Foreign Literary Intelligence..141, 322, 497, 662
—— From England.... 322
—— From France....324, 498, 663
—— From Germany....141, 323, 497, 662
Foreign Religious Intelligence.136, 316, 490, 658
—— From Belgium.... 139
—— From France.... 494
—— From Germany....138, 139, 496
—— From Great Britain....136, 316, 490, 658
—— From Italy.... 320
—— From Portugal.... 321
—— From Russia.... 140
—— The Greek Church.... 140
—— Protestantism....136, 316, 490, 658
—— Roman Catholicism....139, 496
Freedmen's Aid Society, Report of.... 700
Freewill Baptist Quarterly....327, 501, 664

French Protestantism, Works on....Page 324
Fuller: The Two Sabbaths.... 518
Fyfe: British Enterprise beyond the Seas. 454

Gardner, H. C.: Diary of a Country Pastor 853
Geiger: Sadducaeer und Pharisaeer.... 141
Gess und Riggenbach: Apologetische Beitrage.... 142
Giesler: Histoire des Dogmes.... 143
Gillett, E. H.: Life and Times of John Huss 176
Goode, W. H.: Outposts of Zion.... 174
Gratry: Commentaire sur Matthieu.... 143
Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson.... 179
Greeley: specimen pages of The American Conflict.... 524
Guizot: Love in Marriage.... 697
—— Meditations sur la Religion Chretienne 663

Hegenbach: Grundlinien du Liturgik, etc.. 324
Hagenbach on the Later History of the Church.... 195
Summary of his works.... 196
The History of Doctrines.... 197
Tolerance in the Eighteenth century.... 198
Frederick the Great.... 200
Semler.... 201
Gellert.... 203
German estimate of Methodism.... 205
Herder's description of Wesley.... 206
Kant.... 208
Goethe and Schiller.... 211
Strauss and his Life of Christ.... 212
Hagen: Das Nibelungen Lied.... 619
Harkness: Latin Grammar.... 697
Hasse: Geschichte des Alten Bundes.... 823
Haug: Essays on the Parsees.... 278
Haven, E. O.: Universities in America.... 336
Haven, G.: Lay Representation in the M. E. Church.... 332
Havernick: Theologie des Alten Testamentes.... 323
Hawthorne: Our Old Home.... 853
Hazard: Freedom of Mind in Willing.... 694
Head: Daily Walk with Wise Men.... 179
Heard: The Sioux War and the Massacres of 1862 and 1863.... 140
Heaven our Home.... 179
Hebrew Grammar (German).... 143
Heidelberg Catechism.... 849
Herzog: Encyclopadie.... 641
Hibbard: The Religion of Childhood.... 817
Howitt: Land, Labor, and Gold.... 494
Huss, John, Life and Times of.... 176
Huett: La Science de l'Esprit.... 509
Hunt: Life of Edward Livingston.... 496

Infants, Moral Condition of.... 332
Their salvation in case of death.... 332
Views taken by Mercein, Hibbard, and Haven.... 338
Appeal to Scripture.... 336
Christ's sayings concerning children.... 337
A child's character not Christian....339, 365
Hibbard's view of Romans v, 12, etc.... 361
Nothing or too much proven.... 363
Not sustained by facts.... 365
Contradicted by the declaration of Christ to Nicodemus.... 370

James: Life and Times of Louis XIV.... 419
Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie.... 150, 332, 505, 673
Jay's Second Letter: New Rebel Plottings 700
Johson: Australia.... 455
Johsenigen: Gesetzbuch des Manu.... 323
Journal of Sacred Literature..147, 150, 501, 670
Journal of the General Conference of the M. E. Church.... 676
The Infant question.... 676
Action on slavery.... 677

Journal of the General Conference of the M. E. Church:
The subject of lay delegation.....Page 678
Addresses from Corresponding bodies... 680
Julian l'Empereur, Œuvres Completes dc.. 143

Kay: Social Condition of the People of England... 526
Kidder, D. P.: Homiletics..... 356, 531
Kidder's Homiletics..... 641
Preaching as a means of grace..... 642
Homiletics a generic term..... 644
History of preaching..... 646
Proper characteristics of a sermon..... 647
Style of delivery..... 649
The intellectual part of a discourse..... 652
Preaching must be extempore..... 656
Knapp: Chrestomathie Française..... 180
Krehl: Ueber die Religion der Vorislamischen Araber..... 323

Leo the Great and the Papacy in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries..... 574
Papal claims to divine right..... 576
The earlier bishops of Rome..... 578
Character of Leo I..... 579
His high claims for the primacy..... 580
His assumption of power..... 583
His death; his literary works..... 585
The papacy under the kings..... 586
Reunion with the Greek Church..... 588
Gregory I..... 591
The mission of the Romish Church..... 593
Lindsley's Compendium of Tachygraphy.. 531
Livingston, Edward..... 396
The Livingston family..... 396
Early discipline..... 398
He studies law..... 400
In Congress..... 401
Appointed Mayor of New York..... 402
Loss of fortune and removal to New Orleans..... 404
Family relations..... 406
The criminal code for Louisiana..... 409
Appointed Secretary of State..... 412
Minister to France..... 414
Retirement from public life..... 416
His death, his character..... 417
Local Preachers, Sixth Annual Meeting of. 355
London Quarterly Review.....147, 330, 503, 670
London Quarterly Review, (Wesleyan) 148, 330
Lyell: Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, 41, 169
Lytton: Ring of Amasis..... 180

Macaulay: History of England..... 419
Mahan: Palmoni, or the Numerals of Scripture, etc..... 156
Man, the Antiquity of..... 41
Merivale, C.: History of the Romans under the Empire..... 175
Migne: Dictionary of Missionaries..... 143
Mill Agent, The..... 180
Miller: The Headship of Christ, etc..... 157
Miscegenation..... 354
Ministerial Education..... 533
Personal responsibility of the Christian minister..... 533
His greatest temptation..... 535
Necessity of general mental culture..... 536
The study of nature..... 538
The study of man..... 542
The study of books..... 547
Must have a reserved force..... 549
Nobility of the vocation..... 551
Mitchell: Interior of Eastern Australia,... 455
Mohammed's Das Leben..... 141
Moll: Das System der Praktischen Theologie..... 159
Monod: Man's Gift to God..... 179

Montalembert: L'Eglise Libre dans l'Etat Libre.....Page 143
Moral Condition of Infants..... 552
Moral Philosophy of the Institutes of Theology, by Rev. R. Watson.....5, 181
The two schools of philosophy..... 5
Philosophy and theology..... 8
Source of the ideas of right and wrong... 10
Not all derived from revelation..... 12
Ground of the internal evidences of the divinity of the Scriptures..... 13
Moral distinctions intuitively apprehended 15
Proven from universal consciousness.... 17
Watson asserts the contrary..... 20
Errors in his argument..... 24
Moral standards not fluctuating..... 26
Definition of a moral agent..... 182
The nature and authority of conscience.. 183
Influence of culture..... 187
Fundamental ideas of reason..... 188
The specific relations we sustain to moral beings..... 190
Practical ethics..... 190
Conclusion..... 193
M'Whorter, G. C.: Popular Hand-book of the New Testament..... 345

Nadal: A Christian Nation's Ordeal..... 700
Naoroji: Manners and Customs of the Parsees 278
—— The Parsee Religion..... 278
National Review, (London).....147, 330, 503
Negroes in Africa: Condition and Character of..... 77
Influence of Mohammedan Institutions.. 78
Job-ben-Solomon..... 80
Old Paul, or Lahmen Kibby..... 80
Fox's Trip to Footah Bundu..... 84
Negro Arabic MsS.....84–90
New Englander, The 144, 327, 501
Nibelungen Lied, The..... 619
Compared with the Iliad..... 619
Derivation of its materials..... 622
Origin of its present form..... 624
Story of the epic..... 625
Illustrated by frescoes at Munich..... 633
Continued comparison with the Homeric poems..... 636
Influence of Christianity..... 638
Nicodemites of the Sixteenth Century..... 436
In France..... 438
Count of Montbrun, Wm. Briconnet..... 439
Jaques Lefevre..... 440
Wm. Farel..... 441
Death of Lefevre..... 445
Michael D'Arande..... 447
Gérard Roussel..... 448
Calvin's denunciations..... 451
North British Review..... 670

Oppert: Der Presbyter Johannes..... 662

Palmer: Evangelische Pedagogik..... 161
—— Die Moral des Christenthums..... 824
Parker, Theodore, Life of..... 349
Parsees, The..... 278
Origin of the Parsee religion..... 280
Name and form of the Zend-Avesta..... 283
Its authors..... 284
Doctrines of Zoroaster..... 287
The modern Parsees..... 288
Prospects of Parseeism..... 290
Peabody: Christianity the Religion of Nature..... 344
Pecaut: De l'Avenir du Theism Chretien.. 663
Peyrat: Histoire Elementaire et Critique de Jesus..... 499
Phillips, G. S.: The American Republic in Prophecy..... 699
Phillips, Wendell: Speeches, Lectures, and Letters..... 329

Plitt: Evangelische Glaubenslehre....Page 688
Polenz: History of Calvinism..... 498
Poujoulat: St. Augustine, Œuvres Completes 664
Practical Theology, (German)..... 159
Pressel: Johan Calvin 498
Pressensé: L'Eglise et la Revolution Française 499
Prison Association of New-York..... 90
Its origin..... 91
Its objects..... 94
First report..... 95
The solitary and the silent systems..... 97
Second report..... 98
Chartered by the Legislature..... 102
Proposal for a new law..... 104
The work-house built..... 106
Labors of Mr. Beal..... 107
Appointment of a Corresponding Secretary 109
Summary of results..... 110
Puaux: Vie de Calvin..... 499

Quackenbos: Elementary Arithmetic. ... 696
Quarterly Book Table 155, 337, 508, 676

Reade: Savage Africa 696
Reinkens: Hilarius of Poictiers..... 498
Rénan's Life of Jesus, replies to.....144, 323
Revons, E. C.: Savings of Sages..... 352
Riel: Natur und Geschichte..... 142
Ritter: Geographical Studies..... 167
Ritual of the M. E. Church..... 686
Revue Chrétienne.....154, 336, 507
Revue des Deux Mondes.....152, 336, 507, 675
Romans, the, Merivale's History of..... 175

Saints of the Desert, etc..... 29
The first hermit..... 29
St. Anthony of Egypt 30
His character 34
St. Symeon the Stylite..... 37
Hindoo ascetics 40
Schenkel: Der Evangelischen Theologen.. 142
—— Das Charakterbild Jesu..... 519
Schiller 242
His early ability 243
His philosophy..... 244
His poetry..... 245
His private life 248
His dramatic writings..... 249
His religion..... 253
His death 255
Schonberg-Cotta Family, Chronicles of ... 354
Schuyler: A Higher Arithmetic 233
Sepp: Jerusalem und das Heilige Lande... 324
Shedd: History of Christian Doctrines..... 508
Sidney: The Three Colonies of Australia .. 454
Silber: Progressive Lessons in Greek..... 697
Smith: Biblical Dictionary..... 322
Spencer, Herbert: A New System of Philosophy 690
Stanley: Sermons before the Prince of Wales 158
Stevens, A.: Life of Nathan Bangs..... 172
Steward: Mediatorial Sovereignty 322
Strauss: Leben Jesu fur das Deutsche Volk 497
Studien und Kritiken...Pages 150, 332, 504, 671
Symeon the Stylite. (*See* Saints of the Desert.)

Thayer: A Youths' History of the Rebellion 326
Theologische Quartalschrift.....150, 334
Townsend: Temptation and Triumph..... 177
Trail: Literary Characteristics and Achievements of the Bible 158

Universalist Quarterly.....327, 665

Vail, S. N.: Bible against Slavery..... 353
Vincent: Meditations Religieuses..... 143
Visions in Verse 699
Voigt: Papst Pius II..... 142
Voltaire, Siècle de Louis XIV..... 419

Waldenser Brüder, Die Katechismen der .. 498
War for the Union, The..... 307
State Rights 308
John C. Calhoun's agitations..... 309
The crisis, war..... 311
Contraband of war..... 313
The battle won 314
Watson's Theological Institutes, by Levington..... 155
Watson's Theological Institutes, Moral Philosophy of.....5, 181
Wayland: Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers..... 650
Wells: Annual of Scientific Discovery.... 322
Weiss: Die Person Jesu Christi 498
—— Life of Theodore Parker 349
Wilkin: Sir Thomas Browne's Works. (*See* Browne.)
Weill: Mose et la Talmud 664
Werner: Geschichte der Christlichen Theologie 498
Westgrath: Tracks of M'Kinlay and party across Australia..... 455
Westminster Review, The.....148, 320, 650
Whedon, D. D.: Freedom of the Will, The 447
Whedon on the Will..... 7[illegible]
Embarrassments of the question ..... 7[illegible]
Statement of question and definition of terms ..... [illegible]
What is the Will?..... 6[illegible]
Edwards's equivocal "certainly" ..... 6[illegible]
The causational argument..... 6[illegible]
The psychological argument..... 6[illegible]
Proposition concerning motives..... 6[illegible]
The theological argument..... 6[illegible]
The positive argument..... 6[illegible]
Windishmann: Zoroastrische Studien..... 132
Woman and her Saviour in Persia..... 179
Wythe: The Trinitarian Faith..... 709

Yankee Boy at Home, The..... 180
Youmans: Class-book of Chemistry..... 171

Zeitschrift für Historische Theologie. 151, 335, 504
Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaftliche Theologie. 150, 332, 671, 673

1 4581